

**NATIONALISM
AND SECTIONALISM
IN AMERICA
1775-1877**

Select Problems in Historical Interpretation

DAVID M. POTTER

THOMAS G. MANNING

Department of History, Yale University

Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York

Copyright, 1949, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

October, 1961

255
5.56
V.1
1. 1.

27147-0119

Printed in the United States of America

P R E F A C E

If these Select Problems in American history possess any distinctive educational usefulness, it lies in the fact that they attempt to attain certain values which cannot be realized through the standard textbook. There are limitations which seem inherent in the nature of the textbook: notably that, in order to pass rapidly from topic to topic, it must provide a simplified or oversimplified discussion and that, to achieve comprehensiveness, it must predigest the evidence and present the student with a body of conclusions rather than a body of data. In avoidance of this simple, descriptive sequence of narrative events and fixed conclusions, the attempt is made here to single out a major theme in American development, to present various aspects of this theme in terms of a series of Problems relating to it, and to treat these Problems primarily through the medium of source materials so that the student may analyze the factors involved and may explore the complexity of the issues and sense the multiplicity of the possible solutions.

From this statement, it will be apparent at once that the treatment is intensive rather than extensive. This means, of course, that the principal objective of the textbook, namely comprehensive coverage, is sacrificed and that certain important topics are largely disregarded. For example, in the present treatment of the theme of nationalism foreign affairs receive hardly any attention. We believe, however, that as the record of events grows longer, comprehensiveness necessarily entails a certain superficiality. As American history extends to include the New Deal with its numerous important agencies and World War II with its many theaters of operation, the coverage is necessarily spread thinner and thinner. We do not suggest that the ideal of comprehensive coverage should therefore be abandoned, and we have regarded these Problems as partners to rather than substitutes for the textbook. But we do believe that depth as well as breadth should be sought in the study of history, and we hope that the two values are to some extent reconciled by the use of these Problems in conjunction with the textbook.

This is not to say that we have accepted the principle of specialization in the sense of "more and more about less and less." If our coverage is restricted as to factual content, we have tried to maintain range in the types of history treated. In various Problems emphasis is placed upon social history (Problems IV and V), on political history (VIII, XII, and others), on economic history (II, III, VI, and others), on constitutional history (II and IX), and on intellectual history (VII), as well as upon problems of historical method (X) and schools of historical interpretation (XI). The space given to any one topic does not reflect our estimate of its over-all importance in the composite record of American history but suggests rather our belief in its value as a medium for illustrating important forces in history or important questions with which the historian has to deal. The general theme, that of Nationalism and Sectionalism, certainly permeates every aspect of American history in the first century of the republic. The sustained focus upon this theme will enable the teacher, we believe, to impart to the student a more mature sense of the nature of history, the recurrence of forces, the diversity of factors in a given situation, the subtle interplay and fusion of these factors. All this is designed to provide the basis for a deeper understanding without too much specialization. Abraham Lincoln was once quoted by Herndon as saying: "I know that general reading broadens the mind—makes it universal, but it never makes a precise, deep, clear mind. The study of particular cases does do that thing, as I understand it." Without going so far as to claim that any kind of reading can make a mind precise or deep, it is our purpose to provide the "study of particular cases" that may foster these qualities.

In addition to attempting a somewhat more intensive treatment, the Problems also seek to emphasize the underlying forces which manifest themselves in diverse events. When history is presented at a purely descriptive level as a record of past men, past laws, past wars, past issues such as slavery or the doctrine of secession, even the superior student may fail to see much bearing upon the men, laws, or issues of today. But if the student is encouraged to regard specific events as manifestations of general and continuing forces such as nationalism and sectionalism, and if the nature of these forces is explained in a way that will enable him to use them as a frame of reference for the interpretation of a narrative of events, then diverse and seemingly unrelated occurrences begin to appear to some extent merely as variant manifestations of the same continuing forces. For instance, behind the slavery struggle and behind recent contests over the poll tax or the Fair Employment Practices Committee lay the same basic situation of racial dualism and racial tensions in the South. Behind the now obsolete doctrine of secession and the present-day concern over the danger of what is called bureaucracy lay the desire of a minority to forestall encroachment upon its position and the basic question: How much concentration of governmental power is consistent with the principle of local and individual freedom? Behind the earliest contests over the tariff and the most recent ones over regional differentials in railway freight rates, one finds, as a continuing factor, economic cleavages which develop along geographical lines and which therefore have tended and will probably tend in the future to form sectional interests. If history is to fulfill at all its oft-proclaimed function of interpreting the present in the light of the past, it must keep these underlying forces in view. In making this point, we do not deceive ourselves by believing that we have originated an approach that, in fact, good teachers have always used, but we have tried to provide a body of material that will enable the teacher to employ this approach more readily and more successfully.

Quite apart from the study of broad forces, the past may well give more effective illumination to the present when it is regarded as a series of problems or issues rather than as a series of events. Too often the student sees the past through a narrative which presents a topic as an organized group of undisputed facts. Since the opposing programs that produce a sequence of events and a given result cannot be adequately shown in a condensed narrative, the student therefore is likely to think of the events as simple, direct steps toward an inevitable outcome. Yet educators continue to hope that he will be able to apply his learning when he views the present through the medium of the morning paper, in which he confronts issues where the situation is confused, the facts are disputed, the direction of events shifts with the variation of pressure, and the result lies between a number of alternatives. Certainly, if past problems are to aid in the understanding of present ones, the first step is to perceive that they really were problems, attended by as much confusion and controversy, as much uncertainty of the outcome, and as many possible alternatives as those of today. So far as this can be shown consistently with coherent presentation, the Problems attempt to show it.

Along with the goals of intensive analysis and of educing the pertinence of the past to the present, the Problems also seek to present historical material in a form that will prompt the student actively to work with it rather than passively to absorb it. Compared with other courses in the curriculum, history at present occupies an unenviable position in that it does not require its students to take the materials of the subject and work out their own results with these materials. In an English course the student must use his vocabulary plus his knowledge of sentence structure to create intelligible English prose. In any other language course his task is similar. In mathematics he must apply a body of principles and formulae to the solution of a problem. In chemistry, physics or zoology he must go to the laboratory to discover and verify for himself. More often than not, history pre-

sents a sharp contrast to these active studies, for the textbook tells the student only what the historian has found out, not how he discovered it; what conclusions he has reached, not how he arrived at them; what his finished product is, not what raw materials he used. In the Problems the student will encounter conflicting evidence, opposing programs, antagonistic interpretations, and he will be impelled to some extent to take the initiative and to apply something more than a good memory in grappling with them.

Again, we do not mean to minimize the effectiveness with which countless history teachers use standard collections of documents to impart a feeling for the challenge of history and the vitality of the sources, but, since any compilation of documents is essentially a storehouse of diverse materials, it is not easy to bring a number of documents to focus on a single question. Where the incidence of the sources is scattered, the construction of history from them is but faintly perceived. The Problems assemble a variety of sources relating to a single point, in a way that is intended to enable the student himself to apply the historical process, to sense some of the historian's problems in the evaluation of evidence, and to distinguish between verifiable fact and tendentious assertion.

It seems something of an anomaly that a treatment which employs intensive analysis, stresses basic forces and requires student initiative—should be somewhat experimental, even after many years of change in the methods of education. We anticipate that the teacher who uses these Problems will encounter some of the hazards of innovation and will find us blamable for some of the flaws of experiment. But in introducing these materials to college teachers of American history, we can fairly say that the experiment is an applied not a theoretical one. For four years we and our associates have used these Problems and their progenitors in the introductory course at Yale. The response, both of teachers and of students who strained over mimeographed pages, has been better than we could expect, and it convinces us that, despite defects of execution, the values which were sought in the plan are being realized in the classroom.

The sources from which our texts are drawn are indicated in the footnotes. Instead of attempting to regularize these texts, we have followed the originals in their irregularities of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling. Only in a very limited number of cases where obvious typographical errors were involved have we corrected the originals.

Our physical and spiritual obligations are of a kind that it is a pleasure to name and an impossibility to acknowledge. William H. Dunham had a vital part in shaping the original concept from which the Problems evolved; the entire project represents an extension of ideas which were in large part his. Thomas C. Mendenhall also had an important share in originating the project, and he has patiently and imperturbably borne the management of an organization for the typing, mimeographing, assembling, and distributing of Problems; it may suggest the nature of his aid to say that the publication of the Problems will be more of a relief to him than to us. Leonard W. Labaree, as chairman of our department, took a leading part in securing for us the arrangements that were needed in the curriculum and fostered the project with personal encouragement and departmental support.

Many people—students, colleagues, friends—have offered suggestions, general or detailed, by which we are the gainers. Chester McA. Destler at Connecticut College and Samuel H. Brockunier at Wesleyan have been particularly helpful in this way. Our most constant source of aid, and one which is perhaps greater than we can realize, has been our association with colleagues who were teaching the Problems with us: our creditors in this connection are Rodman W. Paul, Howard F. Cline, John W. Davidson, William H. Jordy, Richard S. Barnes, and, in the largest amount of all, Wallace E. Davies. In the typing and editing of the

final manuscript Richard S. and Katherine S. W. Barnes have shown a combination of skill, resourcefulness, and patience such as we believe few writers even hope for, much less encounter. At various earlier stages, long stretches of typing were borne by Julia Hunt, Julie Champlin, Mary Pye, Margaret Cook, Ann Hirshberg, Marjorie Barbour, and Janet Zimmerman.

Finally, to state what is no less important because it is obvious, we would have been nowhere without the Yale University Library, the limits of whose resources and courtesy we have not yet measured.

D. M. P.

T. G. M.

Yale University
December 6, 1948

CONTENTS

I. BEGINNINGS OF AMERICAN NATIONALISM—THE REVOLUTIONARY PERIOD 1-31

PART I: THE MEANING OF NATIONALISM

Hans Kohn, "The Nature of Nationalism" 4

PART II: THE PATH TO INDEPENDENCE

A. The Revolution as a Common Cause 11

1. Extracts from Resolutions Adopted by a Public Meeting at Philadelphia on June 18, 1774 11

2. Extracts from Resolutions Adopted by a Public Meeting at New York on July 6, 1774 12

3. The Declaration of Rights and Grievances, October 14, 1774 12

4. The Non-importation Agreement, October 20, 1774 13

5. The Impact of War 14
Declaration of the Causes and Necessity of Taking up Arms, July 6, 1775

B. The Final Break with the Empire 15

1. *Common Sense* 15
Thomas Paine's Appeal for Independence

2. Opinion in a New England Town 16
Resolutions of a Meeting at Malden, Massachusetts, May 27, 1776

3. The Declaration of Independence, July 2, 1776 16

4. The Declaration Endorsed 17
Resolutions of Connecticut Assembly, October 10, 1776

5. The Declaration Interpreted 17
Debate in the Constitutional Convention, June 19, 1787

PART III: THE LOYALTIES OF REVOLUTIONARY AMERICA

A. The Forces of Division 18

1. A Jerseyman on Virginia 19
Letter of Philip Vickers Fithian, 1774

2. A Bostonian on South Carolina 20
Journal of Josiah Quincy, Jr., 1774

3. A Carolinian on New England 21
Letter of Edward Rutledge, 1776

4. A Virginian Agrees 21
Letter of Carter Braxton, 1776

5. Quakers and Congregationalists 22
John Adams, Account of an Incident at Philadelphia, 1774

6. Dissension in the Army 23
General Orders of George Washington, August 1, 1776

7. A British View 23
Josiah Tucker, *Cui Bono?*

B. The Destiny of America 24

1. National Poetry: Trumbull 24
John Trumbull, "Prospect of the Future Glory of America," 1770

2. National Poetry: Dwight 24
Timothy Dwight, "Columbia," 1777

3. The American Language 25
Noah Webster, *Dissertations on the English Language*, 1789

4. A New Loyalty 26
Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur, *Letters from an American Farmer*

5. War Advances Unity 27
David Ramsay, *History of the American Revolution*

6. Washington's Farewell, 1796 28
George Washington on the Importance of Union

C. The Concept of "My Country" 29

1. From a Letter of John Adams to His Wife, September 18, 1774 29

2. From a Proclamation of Thanksgiving Massachusetts, November 4, 1775 30

3. From a Proclamation of Pennsylvania and Virginia Commissioners, 1775 30

4. From a Letter of Daniel Roberdeau, 1778 30

5. From a Letter of Samuel Adams, 1779 30

6. From the Diary of Sergeant John Smith of Bristol, Rhode Island, 1776 30

7. Nathan Hale 30
Accounts of His Execution, September 22,
1776

II. NATIONALISM AND UNION— ESTABLISHMENT OF THE RE- PUBLIC 33-64

PART I: THE ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION

- A. The Spirit of Union after Independence 38
1. Washington's Appraisal of Unionism,
1780 38
2. Wilson's View 38
James Wilson, Speech in the Constitu-
tional Convention, 1787
3. Virginia as an "Independent Country" 39
Patrick Henry to the Governor of Louisi-
ana, 1778
4. The South Carolina Constitution, 1778 39
Articles Expressive of State Sovereignty
5. Control over Deserters as a Test 40
Thomas Burke, Account of a Debate in the
Continental Congress, 1777
B. Adopting the Articles 41
1. Hopes and Fears in 1776 42
Letters by Members of Congress concern-
ing the Prospects of Union
2. Sovereignty in the Separate States 42
Thomas Burke, Account of His Debate
with James Wilson in the Continental
Congress
3. The Articles Submitted to the States 43
Letter of the Continental Congress, No-
vember 17, 1777
C. The Articles in Operation 44
1. Benjamin Franklin on the State of the
Union, 1787 44
2. John Jay on the State of the Union,
1788 45
3. The Confederation and Foreign Trade 45
Letter of Edmund Randolph, 1787
The *Connecticut Courant*, 1787
4. The *Federalist's* Analysis of the Articles 46
Alexander Hamilton on the Defects of the
Articles, *The Federalist*, Number 15

PART II: THE CONSTITUTION OF 1787

- A. The Role of the States in the New Union 49
1. The Randolph Plan 49
2. The Paterson Plan 50
3. The Plans Debated 51
Excerpts from Madison's Notes
4. Compromise 52
Excerpts from Madison's Notes

- B. Economic Aspects of the New Union 53
1. Appeals to Economic Motive 54
American Museum, June 1787
2. Hamilton on Economic Alignments 55
3. Geography and Constitutional Align-
ments 55
Hampshire Chronicle, December 1787
4. Special Appeals to the Landholding
Class 56
Oliver Ellsworth in the *Connecticut Cou-
rant*
5. Bills of Credit and Federal Authority 57
Alexander Contee Hanson, "Remarks on
the Proposed Plan of a Federal Govern-
ment"
6. Lee on Economic Alignments 57
Richard Henry Lee, "Letters of the Fed-
eral Farmer"
7. Party Alignments in Massachusetts 58
Letter of Henry Knox, 1788

- C. The Nature of the Union 59
1. Federal and National 60
James Madison in *The Federalist*, Num-
ber 39
2. Majority Rule and Minority Rights 62
James Madison in *The Federalist*, Num-
ber 10

III. NATIONALISM AND SECTION- ALISM 65-93

PART I: THE FORCE OF NATIONALISM

- A. Barriers to Closer Union 68
1. Henry Adams on America, 1800 68
History of the United States
2. Size and Unity 69
Edward Gibbon Wakefield on the Dis-
persal of the American Population, 1834
B. The Cement of Union 70
1. Interstate Migration 71
From the Census of 1850
2. The Attitude of the West 72
Frances Wright D'Arusmont, *Views of So-
ciety and Manners in America*, 1821
3. The New Transportation and Com-
munication 72
A Summary by the Editors
4. The New Commerce 74
Guy S. Callender, *The Internal Commerce
of the United States*
5. The Program of Economic National-
ism 75
Speech of John C. Calhoun, February 1817

C. Democracy and Nationalism	76
1. Jefferson's Ideal	77
From His First Inaugural Address, 1801	
2. Nationalism in the Judiciary	78
John Marshall, <i>Cohens v. Virginia</i> , 1821	
3. Nationalism in Foreign Policy: The Monroe Doctrine	79
James Monroe, Message to Congress, 1823	
4. The Nation as Guardian of the Public Welfare: J. Q. Adams	80
Message to Congress, 1825	
5. Reaffirmation of the Democratic Factor: Jackson	81
Message Vetoing Recharter of Bank of the United States, 1832	
6. Manifest Destiny	82
Speech of Robert F. Stockton, 1847	

PART II: THE FORCE OF SECTIONALISM

A. The Meaning of Sectionalism	83
Frederick Jackson Turner, "The Significance of the Section in American History"	
B. Sectionalism in Action	87
1. At the Constitutional Convention	88
James Madison on Sectional Differences, 1787	
2. Sectional Fear of the Constitution	88
Patrick Henry and John Tyler in the Virginia Convention	
3. A Political Issue	88
Thomas Jefferson, Sectionalism and the Federal Apportionment in 1792	
4. An Economic Issue	89
William B. Giles, Sectionalism and the Bounty for Cod Fisheries, 1792	
5. The Missouri Crisis	89
William Plumer, Sectionalism and the Balance of Free and Slave States	
C. Like Two Distinct Currents	90
1. Dual Loyalties: An Objective Report	90
Harriet Martineau on "Sectional Prejudice," 1834	
2. Dual Loyalties: A Subjective Expression	91
Alexander H. Stephens, Speech on the Annexation of Texas, 1845	

IV. LIFE IN THE NORTH AND WEST 95-124

PART I: MEASURES OF SECTIONAL DISTINCTION

A. Climate	99
1. Climatic Conditions	100
Temperature and Growing Season Data for Selected American Cities	

2. Climatic Factors in the Life of the South	100
Ulrich B. Phillips, <i>Life and Labor in the Old South</i>	
3. Climate and Culture	102
Rupert B. Vance, <i>Human Geography of the South</i>	
B. People	103
1. Density of Population	103
Data by States, 1850	
2. Cities in the United States	104
Places of More than 10,000 Population, 1850	
3. Economic Employment of the American People	105
Data by States, 1840	
4. Geographical Distribution of Wealth	106
Thomas P. Kettell, <i>Southern Wealth and Northern Profits</i>	

PART II: SOCIAL PATTERNS OF THE NORTH

1. New England Farm Life	107
Sarah Anna Emery, <i>Reminiscences of a Nonagenarian</i>	
2. More Farm Life	107
Samuel G. Goodrich, <i>Recollections of a Lifetime</i>	
3. Life in a Mill Town	109
Harriet Martineau at Waltham, Massachusetts, 1836	
4. An Adverse Report	110
<i>The Harbinger</i> , 1846	
5. Industry in the American Economy	112
From the Census of 1860	
6. Urban Life	113
Anthony Trollope on New York in 1862	

PART III: SOCIAL PATTERNS OF THE WEST

A. Types of Settlers in the West	117
1. Classes of Settlers	118
Henry B. Fearon, <i>Sketches of America</i> , 1818	
2. The Squatter	118
Timothy Flint, <i>Recollections of the Last Ten Years</i> , 1826	
3. The Small Farmer	119
Harriet Martineau, <i>Society in America</i> , 1837	
4. The Well-to-do or Strong-handed Farmer	119
Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur, <i>Sketches of Eighteenth Century America</i>	
B. Aspects of Western Life	121
1. The Technique of Settlement	121
Thomas Cooper, <i>Some Information Respecting America</i> , 1794	

2. Money and Trade in the Early West 121
Baynard Rush Hall, *The New Purchase*
3. Evolution from the Frontier Condition 123
S. R. Brown, *Western Gazetteer or Emigrant's Directory*, 1817

V. LIFE IN THE SOUTH AND THE CLASH OF SECTIONS . . . 125-150

PART I: SOCIAL PATTERNS OF THE SOUTH

1. A Mississippi Planter's Life . . . 129
A. De Puy Van Buren, *Jottings of a Year's Sojourn in the South*, 1859
2. A Louisiana Magnate . . . 131
Timothy Flint, *Recollections of the Last Ten Years*, 1826
3. A Prosperous Georgian . . . 132
Thomas E. Watson, *Bethany*
4. A Small "Plantation" . . . 133
Mark Twain, *Huckleberry Finn*

PART II: SECTIONAL ANTAGONISMS AND ISSUES

- A. As Others See Us . . . 134
 1. Eastern Views of the Frontier . . . 135
Timothy Dwight, *Travels in New-England and New-York*, 1821
 2. Frontier Views of the East . . . 136
David Crockett, *An Account of Col. Crockett's Tour to the North and Down East*, 1835
 3. Southern Opinion of the North . . 136
De Bow's Review, 1860
 4. A Northern View of the South . . 137
Richard Hildreth, *Despotism in America*, etc., 1840
- B. Issues of Sectional Conflict . . . 139
 1. The Tariff . . . 140
Charles A. and Mary R. Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization*
 2. A Central Banking System . . . 141
Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *The Age of Jackson*
 3. Internal Improvements: The Early Period . . . 142
Homer C. Hockett, *Western Influences on Political Parties to 1826*
 4. Internal Improvements: Some Results 144
Alexander Mackay, *The Western World, or Travels in the United States in 1846-47*
 5. The Public Land Question . . . 146
Raynor G. Wellington, *The Political and Sectional Influence of the Public Lands, 1828-1842*
 6. Congressional Votes as Tests of Sectional Division . . . 148

VI. SLAVERY—THE SECTIONAL TOUCHSTONE . . . 151-181

PART I: THE CONDITION OF SLAVERY

- A. Observations of Free People on Slavery . 156
 1. Slavery: Georgia Rice Fields . . . 156
Frances Anne Kemble, *A Journal of a Residence on a Georgian Plantation*
 2. Slavery: Mississippi Cotton . . . 158
Susan Dabney Smedes, *Memorials of a Southern Planter*
 3. Instructions to the Overseer on His Cotton Plantation by J. W. Fowler, of Coahoma County, Mississippi, in 1857 . . . 161
 4. Instructions to the Overseer on His Cotton Plantation at Thorn Island near Augusta by Alexander Telfair, of Augusta, Georgia, in 1832 . . . 161
- B. Observations of Slaves on Slavery . . . 162
 1. Narrative of Ben Simpson, Age 90, Madisonville, Texas . . . 162
 2. Narrative of Charley Williams, Age 90, Tulsa, Oklahoma . . . 163
 3. Narrative of Jenny Proctor, Age 87, San Angelo, Texas, Telling of Experiences as a Slave in Alabama . . . 163
 4. Narrative of Ellen Betts, Age 84, Houston, Texas . . . 164

PART II: ASPECTS OF SLAVERY

- A. The Domestic Slave Trade . . . 166
Chambers' Monthly Magazine, 1853
- B. The Economics of Slavery . . . 169
Lewis C. Gray, *Economic Efficiency of Slavery*
- C. Free Negroes . . . 172
Ulrich B. Phillips, *Life and Labor in the Old South*
- D. Southern Opinion on Slavery . . . 173
 1. The Biblical Defense of Slavery . . 174
William S. Jenkins, *Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South*
 2. The Wage Slavery Argument . . . 175
James Henry Hammond, Letter to Thomas Clarkson, 1845
 3. The Greek Democracy Argument . . 176
John C. Calhoun, Speech in the Senate, February 6, 1837
 4. The Attitude of Non-slaveholders . . 177
Albert G. Brown, Speech in the Senate, December 22, 1856
- E. Appraisals of Slavery by Modern Historians . . . 178
 1. Effects of the Legal Status of Slavery 178
Dwight L. Dumond, *Anti-Slavery Origins of the Civil War*

2. Effects of the Legal Status of Slavery 179
Avery O. Craven, *The Coming of the Civil War*
3. The Two Types of Slavery 179
George Fort Milton, *The Eve of Conflict*

VII. THE AMERICAN ABOLITION-ISTS 183-211

PART I: THE RELIGIOUS SETTING

- A. Revivals—World-wide and American . . 187
 1. Revivalism 187
Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences
 2. Charles G. Finney 189
Lyman Beecher, Account of a Finney Re-
vival
 3. A Finney Conversion 189
Finney's Account of His Conversion of
Theodore Dwight Weld
- B. The Religious Path to Reform . . . 190
 1. Finney and the Old Orthodoxy . . 190
Gilbert H. Barnes, *The Anti-Slavery Im-
pulse*
 2. William Ellery Channing 191
Theological and Social Doctrines
 3. Emerson's Description of the Reform-
ers, 1844 192

PART II: THE ABOLITIONISTS THEMSELVES

- A. Rivalry for Anti-Slavery Leadership . . 193
 1. An Abolitionist Manifesto 193
Declaration of the National Anti-Slavery
Convention, 1833
 2. The American Colonization Society . 195
On Negro Emigration to Liberia, 1832
- B. The Abolitionist Mind 196
 1. The Religious Spirit of the Abolition-
ists 196
Correspondence of James G. Birney
 2. "Wages of Sin" 198
Letters of Theodore Dwight Weld
 3. Abolitionist Behavior and Opinions . 199
Correspondence of Abolitionist Leaders
 4. The Abolitionist Picture of Slavery . 201
Theodore Dwight Weld, *American Slavery
As It Is*
 5. *Uncle Tom's Cabin* 202
The Slave Auction Scene from Mrs. Stowe's
Novel

PART III: RADICALISM AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

- A. Reaction of the Majority 204
 1. Suppression of the Lane Revolt, 1834 204

2. The Press and Post Office 205
James G. Birney on the Censorship of
Mails in Kentucky, 1835
3. The Death of Elijah P. Lovejoy . . 205
Edward Beecher, *Narrative of Riots at
Alton, 1838*

B. Critical Appraisal 206

1. Sympathetic Criticism 206
Correspondence of Anti-Slavery Leaders
2. Webster on the Abolitionists . . . 208
Speech in the Senate, March 7, 1850
3. Views of Modern Historians . . . 209
Dwight L. Dumond, James G. Randall,
Charles and Mary Beard

VIII. SLAVERY IN POLITICS . 213-247

PART I: SLAVERY AND THE CONSTITUTION

- A. The Pattern of Compromise: Slavery in
the Territories 217
 1. Southern Opinion after 1848: Calhoun 220
Speeches at Charleston, 1847, and in the
Senate, 1850
 2. Northern Democrats: Douglas . . . 224
Speech at Chicago, October 23, 1850
 3. Northern Whigs: Webster 224
Speech in the Senate, March 7, 1850
 4. Northern Whigs: Seward 225
Speech in the Senate, March 11, 1850
- B. Factors of Disruption: The Fugitive Slave
Question 227
 1. Massachusetts Liberty Laws, 1843 . . 227
 2. The Fugitive Slave Act, 1850 . . . 228
 3. State *versus* Federal Courts 229
Ableman v. Booth, 1859
 4. Anthony Burns 230
Charles E. Stevens, The Fugitive Slave Case
of Anthony Burns
- C. Factors of Disruption: The Undoing of
Compromise 233
 1. Kansas-Nebraska 234
The Territorial Act of 1854
 2. The Dred Scott Decision, 1857 . . 234

PART II: THE CLIMAX OF THE SLAVERY CON- TROVERSY

- A. Lincoln and Douglas 236
 1. Douglas's View 237
Selections from the Debates with Lincoln
 2. Lincoln on Slavery in the Territories 239
Speech at Peoria, 1854
 3. Lincoln on Slavery in the States . . 241
Private and Public Expressions of His
Views

4. Lincoln and Negro Rights Selections from the Debates with Douglas	243	5. Webster's Theses Selections from His Speeches	262
B. Was the Victory of Lincoln and His Party a Threat to the Institution of Slavery?	244	6. Lincoln's Philosophy Inaugural Address, March 4, 1861	265
1. Extracts from Professor Cole's Discus- sion, 1931	244	PART II: THE AMERICAN COMPACT	
2. Extracts from Professor Hamilton's Discussion, 1932	245	A. The Union in 1787: "We, the People"	266
C. The Adequacy of the Political Issues as a Cause of Sectional Strife	246	1. James Madison's Notes on the Consti- tutional Convention	267
1. James G. Randall's Analysis, 1945	247	Passages relating to the Preamble	
IX. SECTIONALISM AND THE CON- STITUTION—THE NATURE OF THE UNION	249-274	2. Daniel Webster's Interpretation of the Preamble to the Constitution	268
PART I: SOME GOVERNMENTAL CONCEPTS AND THEIR APPLICATION		3. Justice Story's Analysis	268
A. The Nature of Government: The Ques- tion of Sovereignty	253	Joseph Story, <i>Commentaries on the Con- stitution</i> , 1833	
1. James Madison's Interpretation	254	4. Alexander H. Stephens' Analysis	268
Letter to Nicholas P. Trist, February 16, 1830		<i>A Constitutional View of the Late War Between the States</i>	
2. Jackson's Formula	254	5. A Confederate View: Bledsoe	269
Proclamation to the People of South Caro- lina, 1832		Albert T. Bledsoe, <i>Was Davis a Traitor?</i>	
3. Mr. Justice Story Speaks	254	6. The Preamble and the Theory of Se- cession	271
Joseph Story, <i>Commentaries on the Con- stitution</i> , 1833		Bangor (Maine) <i>Daily Union</i> , November 13, 1860	
4. A Later Southern View	255	B. The Union in 1860: Static Law and Dy- namic Force	272
Alexander H. Stephens, <i>A Constitutional View of the Late War Between the States</i>		<i>De Bow's Review</i> , 1851, States' Rights and Southern Nationalism	
5. A Later Northern View	256	X. THE OUTBREAK OF THE CIVIL WAR	275-300
Abraham Lincoln, Message to Congress, July 4, 1861		PART I: LINCOLN'S ANSWER TO SECESSION	
B. The Nature of Government: Theories of the Source of Political Authority	257	A. Lincoln's Statement of His Policy	280
Stephen Leacock, Four Theories of the Origin of the State		1. The Inaugural Address, March 4, 1861	280
C. American Applications of Theories as to the Source of Political Authority	259	2. The Question of the Forts	282
1. Seward on the Union	260	From the First Draft of the Inaugural Ad- dress	
Speeches in the Senate, March 11, 1850, and February 29, 1860		3. Lincoln on Collection of Customs	282
2. An Editor's Explanation	261	Letter of Lincoln to the Secretary of the Treasury, March 18, 1861	
<i>Morning Courier and New York Enquirer</i> , January 8, 1861		B. Contemporary Interpretations of Lin- coln's Inaugural Address	283
3. Jefferson's Opinion	261	1. "The Inaugural," Editorial in Rich- mond (Va.) <i>Dispatch</i> , March 5, 1861	283
The Kentucky Resolutions of 1798		2. "Mr. Lincoln's Inaugural," Editorial in <i>Raleigh North Carolina Stand- ard</i> , March 9, 1861	283
4. A Confederate Elaboration	262	3. "What Does He Mean?," Editorial in the Providence (R.I.) <i>Daily Post</i> , March 8, 1861	285
Jefferson Davis, <i>Rise and Fall of the Con- federate Government</i>		4. Editorial on the Policy of the New Administration, in the <i>New York Tribune</i> , March 27, 1861	286

PART II: THE OUTBREAK OF HOSTILITIES

A. Lincoln's Account of the Firing on Sumter	287
1. Lincoln to Congress, July 4, 1861	287
B. The Proposed Evacuation of Sumter	289
1. Lincoln's Pre-inaugural Attitude on the Sumter Question	289
Letter of C. S. Morehead, February 23, 1862	
2. More Evidence on the Alleged Assurance	289
Diary of John Hay, October 22, 1861	
3. As Welles Saw It	289
Diary of Gideon Welles	
4. Public Opinion and Expectation on the Proposed Evacuation of Sumter	290
David M. Potter, <i>Lincoln and His Party in the Secession Crisis</i>	
5. A Turning Point	290
Memorandum of General Winfield Scott, March 1861	
6. Lincoln's Reaction to the Scott Memorandum	291
Letter of Montgomery Blair, May 6, 1862	
7. The Next Step	291
Lincoln's Order for the Preparation of an Expedition, March 29, 1861	
C. Sumter and Pickens: Interchangeable Symbols of Union	291
1. Lincoln's First Steps in Relation to Fort Pickens	292
John G. Nicolay and John Hay, <i>Abraham Lincoln, A History</i>	
2. Instructions of the War Department to Captain Vogdes, March 12, 1861	292
3. The Navy Reports	292
Letter of Captain H. A. Adams to Navy Department, April 1, 1861	
4. Reply to Adams	293
Order of Navy Department, April 6, 1861	
D. The Final Crisis at Sumter	293
1. Instructions of the Secretary of War to Captain Gustavus V. Fox of the U. S. Navy, April 4, 1861	293
2. Instructions of the Secretary of the Navy to Captain Samuel Mercer, U. S. Navy, April 5, 1861	293
3. Report of Captain Gustavus V. Fox, February 24, 1865, on His Command of the Sumter Expedition	294
4. Letter of Lincoln to Major Anderson, Dated April 4, 1861	295
5. Letter of Lincoln to Robert S. Chew, Special Messenger of the State Department, Dated April 6, 1861	295

6. Letter of Captain Theodore Talbot, United States Army, to the Secretary of War, April 12, 1861	295
7. Letter of General Beauregard to Major Anderson, April 11, 1861	295
8. Reply of Major Anderson to General Beauregard, April 11, 1861	296
9. Second Letter of Beauregard to Anderson, April 11, 1861	296
10. Second Response of Anderson to Beauregard, April 12, 1861	296
11. Letter of James Chesnut, Jr., and Stephen D. Lee, Aides-de-camp of General Beauregard, to Major Anderson, April 12, 1861	296
E. Did the Lincoln Administration Violate a Pledge to Evacuate Sumter?	297
John A. Campbell, Account of Transactions with William H. Seward	
F. Did Lincoln Deliberately Precipitate War?	298
1. Indictment of Lincoln	298
Charles W. Ramsdell, "Lincoln and Fort Sumter"	
2. Defense of Lincoln	299
David M. Potter, <i>Lincoln and His Party in the Secession Crisis</i>	

XI. INTERPRETATIONS OF THE CIVIL WAR 301-330

PART I: WHAT WAS THE PRIMARY ISSUE?

A. The Slavery Issue	305
1. Lincoln's Views	305
Speech at Chicago, 1858, and Second Inaugural, 1865	
2. Slavery the Indirect Cause	306
Madison (Wis.) <i>Argus</i> , May 4, 1861	
3. Slavery a Direct Cause	307
Henry Wilson, <i>History of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America</i>	
4. Property Tenure or Caste Barrier?	308
Edward A. Pollard, <i>The Lost Cause Regained</i>	
B. The States' Rights Issue	308
1. As Alexander H. Stephens Saw It	308
<i>A Constitutional View of the Late War Between the States</i>	
2. The Border States and Secession	309
Charlottesville (Va.) <i>Review</i> , January 4, 1861	
C. The Union Issue	310
1. "The Object of the War," Editorial in the Concord <i>New Hampshire Patriot and State Gazette</i> , May 8, 1861	310

2. "The War," Editorial in the New Orleans Bee, May 1, 1861 . . .	311	Charles Sumner, Speech in the Senate, February 6, 1865	337
3. The Congressional War Aim . . .	311	2. Carl Schurz' Opinion	337
Resolution Adopted by the House of Representatives, July 22, 1861		Report to Congress, 1865	
4* Lincoln's War Aim: Reply to Greeley .	311	3. Thaddeus Stevens	338
Letter of August 22, 1862		Speech in the House, January 3, 1867	
5. Lincoln's War Aim: Gettysburg . .	311	B. Southern and Northern Opinion . . .	338
Address of November 19, 1863		1. Governor B. G. Humphreys of Mississippi	339
6. The Union Issue in Perspective . .	312	Address upon Assuming Office, October 1865	
Nathaniel W. Stephenson, <i>Lincoln</i>		2. President Johnson Interviews a Group of Negroes, February 1866	339
D. The Issue of Rival Economies Seeking Dominance	312	Edward McPherson, <i>The Political History of the United States . . . during the Period of Reconstruction</i>	
1. An American Marxist Interpretation .	312	3. Northern Skepticism about Negro Suffrage	343
A. M. Simons, <i>Class Struggles in America</i>		Howard K. Beale, <i>The Critical Year</i>	
2. The Economic Interpretation . . .	314	George Fort Milton, <i>The Age of Hate</i>	
Charles A. and Mary R. Beard, <i>The Rise of American Civilization</i>		PART II: THE DEFEAT OF THE RADICAL PROGRAM	
E. The Issue of Incompatible Civilizations .	317	A. Defects of a Political Reform	345
1. "Are We One People?," Editorial in the Burlington (Vt.) <i>Daily Times</i> , May 14, 1861	317	1. The Douglass Analysis	345
2. Dualism: Modern Writers	317	Frederick Douglass, <i>Life and Times</i>	
Edward Channing and James Truslow Adams		2. Stevens: The Land Question	346
F. Comment on the Foregoing Issues . .	318	Thaddeus Stevens, Speeches, March 19, 1867, and September 9, 1865	
James G. Randall, "The Civil War Re-studied"	318	3. The DuBois View	347
PART II: THE NATURE OF THE CIVIL WAR		William E. B. DuBois, <i>Black Reconstruction</i>	
A. The Irrepressible Conflict?	320	B. If Lincoln Had Lived	347
1. "The Irrepressible Conflict"	320	1. A Southern Judgment	347
Speech of William H. Seward, October 28, 1858		Henry T. Thompson, <i>Ousting the Carpet-bagger from South Carolina</i>	
2. The Conflict "Repressible"	322	2. Lincoln Would Have Succeeded . .	348
Avery O. Craven, <i>The Repressible Conflict</i>		James G. Randall, <i>Lincoln, The Liberal Statesman</i>	
B. Who was Right? Who was Wrong? .	325	3. Lincoln Would Have Failed	348
1. Both Sections Exonerated	326	J. R. Ficklen, <i>History of Reconstruction in Louisiana</i>	
Charles Francis Adams, "The Ethics of Secession," 1902		4. Lincoln's Own Program	348
2. Both Sections Blamed	327	Speech of April 11, 1865	
Gerald W. Johnson, <i>The Secession of the Southern States</i>		C. The Forces of Nationalism	350
3. The War and American Nationalism	329	1. Governor Andrew Proposes a Basis for Reunion	350
James Russell Lowell, "Reconstruction," 1865		John A. Andrew, Message to the Massachusetts Legislature, January 4, 1866	
XII. THE POLITICAL STATUS OF THE NEGRO AFTER APPOMATTOX—AN ISSUE BETWEEN THE NATION AND THE SECTION	331-356	2. Business and Reconstruction . . .	351
PART I: THE ISSUE OF NEGRO SUFFRAGE		Letter of Henry D. Cooke to Jay Cooke, February 17, 1867	
A. The Radical Republican Ideal . . .	336	<i>Commercial and Financial Chronicle</i> , 1867	
1. The Sumner Thesis	336	3. A Liberal Republican View	352
		<i>The Nation</i> , 1874	
		4. "The Road to Reunion"	354
		<i>The Nation</i> , 1877	

Select Problems
in Historical Interpretation

I

Beginnings of American Nationalism— The Revolutionary Period

SHALL lordly Hudson part contending powers
And broad Potomac lave two hostile shores?

The Anarchiad, 1786–87

I am not a Virginian, but an American.

PATRICK HENRY, 1774

Philadelphia, with all its trade and wealth, and regularity,
is not Boston. The morals of our people are much better;
their manners are more polite and agreeable; they are purer
English; our language is better; our taste is better; our per-
sons are handsomer; our spirit is greater, our laws are wiser,
our religion is superior, our education is better.

JOHN ADAMS, 1774

CONTENTS

Questions for Study	2
Historical Background	3
Part I: The Meaning of Nationalism	4
Part II: The Path to Independence	10
Part III: The Loyalties of Revolutionary America	18

QUESTIONS FOR STUDY

1. When nineteenth-century writers sought to fix the time of origin of the American nation, they based their conclusions upon analysis and interpretation of the precise, literal language of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and other documents. In the light of Kohn's treatment, what is the fallacy of such an approach?
2. Kohn declares that "Periods of oppression or danger from the outside may arouse a feeling of nationalism in the masses." How do the materials in Part II, Section A, illustrate this? Which of the specific attributes of nationalism mentioned by Kohn (pp. 8-9) are evident in these selections?
3. On the basis of the five items in Part II, Section B, give a summary of the reasons for and against regarding independence as the collective act of America as a whole, rather than the individual act of the states separately.
4. If nationalism, as Kohn declares, involves the attributes of common descent, language, territory, political entity, customs and traditions, and religion, what specific limitations upon national development in the 'Sixties and 'Seventies can be inferred from the selections in Part III, Section A?
5. Kohn declares that "nationalism is inconceivable . . . without the complete revision of the position of ruler and ruled, of classes and castes." Which of the selections illustrates the operation of this principle in the development of American nationalism?
6. What effect did the actual waging of war—the recruitment of armies, the conduct of campaigns, the fighting of battles, etc.—have upon the advancement of American nationalism?
7. What aspect of nationalism, as analyzed by Kohn, was of special concern to Noah Webster? Summarize Webster's arguments concerning the importance of his speller and his later dictionary as nationalizing forces.
8. Tucker's prediction that the Americans would remain "disunited to the end of time" has proved entirely wrong. Were his reasons for expecting disunion logical, and was his forecast based upon a fair appraisal of conditions at the time? Why did it prove to be wrong?
9. Comment on the use of the word "country" in Roberdeau's statement that he could weep for his "suffering Country, cramped . . . by the want of provisions with which our Country abounds."
10. What are the reasons for believing that Nathan Hale literally said that he regretted he had but one life to lose for his country? What are the reasons for not believing it? If he did say it, what did it suggest as to nationalist feeling? If he did not, what does William Hull's story show as to the later development of nationalist feeling?
11. On the basis of all the materials, and especially on the basis of Washington's Farewell Address, how far had nationalism in America developed or failed to develop by the end of the eighteenth century? Again, use Kohn's standards in evaluating the specific features of this situation.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The theme of nationalism, which runs through this series of problems, occupies a major place in modern world history. Aspirations to national strength have marked the rise of Great Britain, France, Germany, Soviet Russia, the United States, and every other "great power" as well as many lesser ones for the last three hundred years. In recent times national strivings have begun to assume in Asia the same importance which they have long held in Europe and America. National cupidity and national rivalries contributed immeasurably to cause the great wars of 1914-1918 and 1939-1945, and when the League of Nations and the United Nations were created after these wars for the purpose of curbing uncontrolled national power, both organizations encountered troubles arising from the fact that they were not associations of peoples—they had no citizens—but were themselves formed by national units and operated by officials who gave first loyalty to the member nations which they represented. In general, most of the constructive achievements and the grave dangers of modern civilization are associated with some aspect of nationalism, and it is an open question whether this extraordinary force is a blessing or a curse.

Regardless of the social value of nationalism, however, no one can escape the fact that the nations are the units of which the modern world is built. This being true, there is hardly a fact of greater importance in the world today than the tremendous national strength of the United States. The only other single force which appears at all comparable is that of Soviet Russia, but the divergence of Soviet and American policies simply serves to underscore the critical significance of American strength. If this country uses its power wisely nothing will contribute more to long-range world progress; if it uses it recklessly, not only the American people but the people of the world will suffer in consequence.

In such a situation, it is easy to assume that the states of the American Union were naturally and automatically destined to form one great national unit. But this was not inevitably true. For a period of more than a century and a half, the English-speaking peoples of America were colonial subjects of Great Britain, and were linked to one another only by their common allegiance to the British crown. Even after the adoption of the Constitution, political developments tended to stress at one time the fusion of the states into a single consolidated union and at another their retention of separate individuality. For nearly half of the period of the republic—until 1865—the basic question was whether the American Union constituted a nation, and the most important development was the affirmation that it did; but this affirmation was not given except through four years of war. Throughout this contest, the decision whether there should be one American republic, or two of them, often hung by a hair.

Because of the vital importance of the creation of a fully developed nation in the United States, the Problems in this volume deal with various aspects of American nationalism and of the sectional forces which resisted it, up to the end of the Civil War. These aspects, as will appear, took diverse forms, and the opposing tendencies of sectionalism and nationalism, as will also appear, were at times very evenly matched. Some of these matters will be studied in connection with the later Problems. But meanwhile the immediate purpose of the first Problem is to examine how much of a basis for American nationalism existed at the time of the War of Independence—that is, roughly, during the seventeen-seventies and eighties. Were the revolting colonies mere allies in a war for separate independence, or was the "patriot cause" already the cause of American union? Was the Union, as Abraham Lincoln subsequently declared, older than the Constitution, or did later nationalist patriots read into the history of the Revolution a meaning that was not there?

THE PROBLEM

Part I.

THE MEANING OF NATIONALISM

Before it is possible to measure the progress of nationalism at a given time, in a given place, it is necessary to examine very carefully what nationalism is, what qualities go to make it up, what it has in common with other forms of group feeling, and what features distinguish it from these other forms. Especially, it is necessary to draw a distinction between the product or result of nationalism, which is a government, and the impulse of nationalism, which is an attitude of mind, a feeling of group consciousness that seeks its fulfilment in the formation of the group into an independent or "sovereign" people with a government of its own. The product, of course, is definite and tangible; the impulse is indefinite and elusive. Either government exists or it does not, and its beginning can be dated, but an attitude of mind can exist in some people while it is lacking in others, and it may crystallize slowly and imperceptibly. Governments may be recognized by objective standards; they have capitals, boundaries, flags, laws, armies and navies; but a group feeling cannot be measured by these externals. Yet no nation with the tangible features of national existence ever came into being until a people developed aspirations toward national unity.

Because in this basic sense nationalism is a psychological phenomenon, and yet one which expresses itself in group action, group organization, and in literary, political, cultural, and military terms, the concept requires careful scrutiny. An analysis of the concept is presented in the present Problem through excerpts from a recent and authoritative study by Hans Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism*.¹

The following discussion is from Kohn's chapter on "The Nature of Nationalism." In reading the selection it is convenient to observe that the author discusses first certain factors necessary to nationalism and certain historical developments that had to occur before it could appear in its modern form; second, the relationship between nationalism and other forms of group consciousness; and third, a number of the most characteristic attributes of a fully developed nationalism. In reading this analysis, and especially the third part, the student should watch for specific tests which he can use in judging what degree of national feeling existed in a given situation. In the latter part of the Problem, it will be possible to apply such tests in the interpretation of a series of documents which reflect some of the attitudes prevalent at the time of the American Revolution.

Nationalism as we understand it is not older than the second half of the eighteenth century. Its first great manifestation was the French Revolution, which gave the new movement an increased dynamic force. Nationalism had become manifest, however, at the end of the eighteenth century almost simultaneously in a number of widely separated European countries. Its time in the evolution of mankind had arrived, and although the French Revolution was one of the most powerful factors in its intensification and spread, this did

not mark the date of its birth. Like all historical movements, nationalism has its roots deep in the past. The conditions which made its emergence possible had matured for centuries before they converged at its formation. These political, economic, and intellectual developments took a long time for their growth, and proceeded at a different pace in the various countries. It is impossible to grade them according to their importance or to make one dependent upon another. All are closely interconnected, each reacting upon the others; and although their growth can be traced separately, their effects and consequences cannot be separated otherwise than in the analysis of the scholar; in life, they are indissolubly intertwined.

Nationalism is inconceivable without the ideas of popular sovereignty preceding—without a complete revision of the position of ruler and ruled, of classes and castes. The aspect of the universe and of society had to be secularized with the help of a new natural science and of natural law as understood by Grotius and Locke. The traditionalism of economic life had to be broken by the rise of the third estate, which was to turn the attention away from the royal courts and their civilization to the life, language, and arts of the people. This new class found itself less bound by tradition than the nobility or clergy; it represented a new force striving for new things; it was ready to break with the past, flouting tradition in its opinion even more than it did in reality. In its rise, it claimed to represent not only a new class

and its interests, but the whole people. Where the third estate became powerful in the eighteenth century—as in Great Britain, in France, and in the United States—nationalism found its expression predominantly, but never exclusively, in political and economic changes. Where, on the other hand, the third estate was still weak and only in a budding stage at the beginning of the nineteenth century, as in Germany, Italy, and among the Slavonic peoples, nationalism found its expression predominantly in the cultural field. Among these peoples, at the beginning it was not so much the nation-state as the *Volkgeist* and its manifestations in literature and folklore, in the mother tongue, and in history, which became the center of the attention of nationalism. With the growing strength of the third estate, with the political and cultural awakening of the masses, in the course of the nineteenth century, this cultural nationalism soon turned into the desire for the formation of a nation-state.

The growth of nationalism is the process of integration of the masses of the people into a common political form. Nationalism therefore presupposes the existence, in fact or as an ideal, of a centralized form of government over a large and distinct territory. This form was created by the absolute monarchs, who were the pacemakers of modern nationalism; the French Revolution inherited and continued the centralizing tendencies of the kings, but at the same time it filled the central organization with a new spirit and gave it a power of cohesion unknown before. Nationalism is unthinkable before the emergence of the modern state in the period from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century. Nationalism accepted this form, but changed it by animating it with a new feeling of life and with a new religious fervor.

For its composite texture, nationalism used in its growth some of the oldest and most primitive feelings of man, found throughout history as important factors in the formation of social groups. There is a natural tendency in man—and by “natural tendency” we mean a tendency which, having been produced by social circumstances from time practically immemorial, appears to us as natural—to love his birthplace or the place of his childhood sojourn, its surroundings, its climate, the contours of hills and valleys, of rivers and trees. We are all subject to the immense power of habitude, and even if in a later stage of development we are attracted by the unknown and by change, we delight to come back and to be at rest in the reassuring sight of the familiar. Man has an easily understandable preference for his own language as the only one which he thoroughly understands and in which he feels at home. He prefers native customs and native food to alien ones, which appear to him unintelligible and indigestible. Should he

travel, he will return to his chair and his table with a feeling of relaxation and will be elated by the joy of finding himself again at home, away from the strain of a sojourn in foreign lands and contact with foreign peoples.

Small wonder that he will take pride in his native characteristics, and that he will easily believe in their superiority. As they are the only ones in which civilized people like himself can apparently feel at home, are they not the only ones fit for human beings? On the other hand, contact with alien men and alien customs, which appear to him strange, unfamiliar, and therefore threatening, will arouse in him a distrust of everything foreign. This feeling of strangeness will again develop in him sentiments of superiority, and sometimes even of open hostility. The more primitive men are, the stronger will be their distrust of strangers, and therefore the greater the intensity of their group feeling. Rudyard Kipling, in his poem “The Stranger,” forcefully expressed this general feeling:

The Stranger within my gate,
He may be true or kind,
But he does not talk my talk—
I cannot feel his mind.
I see the face and the eyes and the mouth,
But not the soul behind.

The men of my own stock
They may do ill or well,
But they tell the lies I am wonted to,
They are used to the lies I tell;
And we do not need interpreters
When we go to buy and sell.

The Stranger within my gates,
He may be evil or good,
But I cannot tell what powers control—
What reasons sway his mood;
Nor when the Gods of his far-off land
May repossess his blood.

These feelings have always existed. They do not form nationalism; they correspond to certain facts—territory, language, common descent—which we also find in nationalism. But here they are entirely transformed, charged with new and different emotions, and embedded in a broader context. They are the natural elements out of which nationalism is formed; but nationalism is not a natural phenomenon, not a product of “eternal” or “natural” laws; it is a product of the growth of social and intellectual factors at a certain stage of history. Some feeling of nationality, it may be said, existed before the birth of modern nationalism—a feeling varying in strength and in frequency from time to time: at some epochs almost completely extinguished, at others more or less clearly discernible. But it was largely unconscious and inarticulate. It

did not influence the thought and actions of men in a deep and all-pervading way. It found a clear expression only occasionally in individuals, and in groups only at times of stress or provocation. It did not determine their aims or actions permanently or in the long run. It was no purposeful will welding together all the individuals into a unity of emotions, thoughts, and actions.

Before the age of nationalism, the masses very rarely became conscious of the fact that the same language was spoken over a large territory. In fact, it was not the same language; several dialects existed side by side, sometimes incomprehensible to the man of a neighboring province. The spoken language was accepted as a natural fact. It was in no way regarded as a political or cultural factor, still less as an object of political or cultural struggle. During the Middle Ages, people deduced from the Bible that the diversity of languages was the result of the sinfulness of man, and God's punishment for the building of the Tower of Babel. Consciousness of language was aroused only at times of expeditions and travel or in frontier districts. There, the alien character of the group speaking the alien language was felt, and many national groups were first recognized as different and named by those of alien tongue. The Greek word *barbaros* (which meant "strange" or "foreign," and in consequence "rude" and "ignorant") probably had its source in the idea of stammering or inability to speak in a comprehensible way—a word akin to the Sanskrit expression *barbara*, which meant "stammering" or "non-Aryan." The Slavs called the Germans with whom they came into contact *niemci*, "the mutes," people who cannot make themselves understood. A man speaking an incomprehensible tongue seemed outside the pale of civilization. But language was accepted by the Slavs and by other peoples as a natural fact, not as a cultural inheritance. The language in which the treasures of civilization were inherited and transferred—in medieval Europe as well as in Islam, in India as well as in China—was generally not the language spoken by the people: it was a learned language accessible only to the educated class. Even if it was not a language of different origin, it was generally so archaic and so rich in many purely literary, classical associations that it was understood only by a small minority.

Before nationalism, language was very rarely stressed as a fact on which the prestige and power of a group depended. Alien languages remained until the very recent centuries the languages used by official bodies, in the scholarly world, or among the upper classes. To mention only one fact which stands for a large number, the Breton estates, which were very jealous of their independence, nevertheless spoke French, and in the Act of Union for the Defense of the Liberties of Brittany of

1719 the Breton spokesmen did not mention language grievances. The translations of the Bible in Protestant countries were not undertaken from any motives of nationalism, but purely for the spreading of the true religion. Queen Elizabeth had the Bible and the Prayer Book translated into Welsh, and divine service held in Welsh, to liberate the Welsh from the "ignorance of popery." With the growth of nationalism in the following centuries, still dominated by religion but already harboring the seeds of the new growth, the translations of the Bible certainly were effective in rousing national feeling and in giving a new importance to the national language—which through the spread of popular education and the wider use of the printing press became more and more an element of growing cultural importance. At the same time, the language became uniform, obliterating the vernacular dialects or pushing them into the background, and covering a greater territory as its undisputed domain.

This large territory became an object of love to its inhabitants as a result of a long and difficult process. This love of the homeland, which is regarded as the heart of patriotism, is not a "natural" phenomenon, but an artificial product of historical and intellectual development. The homeland which a man "naturally" loves is his native village or valley or city, a small territory well known in all its concrete details, abounding in personal memories, a place in which his life was generally lived throughout its whole span. The whole territory inhabited by what we should consider today a nationality—a territory frequently distinguished by great diversity of landscape and climate—was practically unknown to the average man, and could become known only by instruction or travel, which before the age of nationalism were limited to a very small minority. Voltaire, who lived before this age, pointed out that "plus cette patrie devient grande, moins on l'aime, car l'amour partagé s'affaiblit. Il est impossible d'aimer tendrement une famille trop nombreuse qu'on connaît à peine."

Nationalism is not, as some scholars under the influence of Aristotle suggest, a harmonious natural growth qualitatively identical with the love for family and home. It is frequently assumed that man loves in widening circles—his family, his village, his tribe or clan, the nation, and finally humanity and the supreme good. But love of home and family is a concrete feeling accessible to everyone in daily experience, while nationalism, and in an even higher degree cosmopolitanism, is a highly complex and originally an abstract feeling. It gains the emotional warmth of concreteness only through the effects of an historical development which, by means of education, economic interdependence, and corresponding political and

social institutions, brings about the integration of the masses and their identification with a body far too great for any concrete experience. Nationalism—our identification with the life and aspirations of uncounted millions whom we shall never know, with a territory which we shall never visit in its entirety—is qualitatively different from the love of family or of home surroundings. It is qualitatively akin to the love of humanity or of the whole earth. Both belong to what Nietzsche called (in *Thus Spake Zarathustra*) *Fernstenliebe*, love of those far away, and which he distinguished from the *Nächstenliebe*, love of those near by.

Life in a common territory, subject to the same influences of nature and, to an important although lesser degree, to the same influences of history and legal systems, produces certain common attitudes and traits, often called national character. We find in the literature of all peoples throughout history frequent characterizations of national groups such as the Gauls or the Greeks, the Germans or the English. Some of these traits seem to persist for a long time, and are mentioned by observers in different centuries. Other traits seem to change under the influence of historical developments. There are known instances of change, within a few decades, in what was considered at a certain time the most essential character trait of a nation. In the beginning of the eighteenth century, when the English were considered a nation most inclined to revolution and to change, while the French seemed a most stable and stolid nation, Voltaire wrote: "The French are of the opinion, that the government of this island is more tempestuous than the sea which surrounds it, which indeed is true." One hundred years later, just the opposite opinion about the English and the French was generally held. The English were then, and are today, considered—by themselves and others—as a stolid nation, proud in their disinclination to violent revolution; while the French were considered a people easily given to and delighting in revolutionary upheavals.

A similar change took place in opinion about the Germans. One hundred years ago, they were thought a very lovable and most impractical people, fit for metaphysics and music and poetry but unfit for modern industry and business. Now the Germans produce very few, if any metaphysicians, musicians, or poets of renown; but on the other hand they have become successful and ruthless bullies and hard and efficient masters in modern industry and business. The Mongols under Genghis Khan were warriors famous for their belligerence, and brought all Asia and half of Europe under their yoke. In the sixteenth century, through the adoption of Lamaist Buddhism, their old spirit was completely broken and they were turned into peaceful and pious men. Under the

influence of the Soviet government and its revolutionary propaganda the wild instincts of the race have been reawakened, and a new and different consciousness has started to animate the Mongol people and to break their religious inhibitions. . . .

Nationalism is first and foremost a state of mind, an act of consciousness, which since the French Revolution has become more and more common to mankind. The mental life of man is as much dominated by an ego-consciousness as it is by a group-consciousness. Both are complex states of mind at which we arrive through experiences of differentiation and opposition, of the ego and the surrounding world, of the we-group and those outside the group. The collective or group consciousness can center around entirely different groups, of which some have a more permanent character—the family, the class, the clan, the caste, the village, the sect, the religion, etc.—whereas others are of a more or less passing character—school-mates, a football team, or passengers on a ship. In each case, varying with its permanence, this group-consciousness will strive towards creating homogeneity within the group, a conformity and like-mindedness which will lead to and facilitate concerted common action. In that sense, we may speak of a group-mind and a group-action. We may speak of a Catholic mind and a Catholic action. We may speak of an English mind and an English action; but we may also speak of a rural mind or an urban mind, and of the action of rural or urban groups. All these groups develop their own character. The character of an occupational group, such as peasants, soldiers, civil servants, may be as clearly defined and stable as any character of a national group, or even more so. Each group creates its own symbols and social conventions, is dominated by social traditions, which find their expression in the public opinion of the group.

Group-consciousness is never exclusive. Men find themselves members of different groups at the same time. With the growth of the complexity of civilization, the number of groups of which men find themselves a part generally increases. These groups are not fixed. They have changing limits, and they are of changing importance. Within these pluralistic, and sometimes conflicting, kinds of group-consciousness there is generally one which is recognized by man as the supreme and most important, to which therefore, in the case of conflict of group-loyalties, he owes supreme loyalty. He identifies himself with the group and its existence, frequently not only for the span of his life, but for the continuity of his existence beyond this span. This feeling of solidarity between the individual and the group may go, at certain times, as far as complete submergence of the individual in the group. The whole education of the members

of the group is directed to a common mental preparedness for common attitudes and common actions.

In different periods of history, and in different civilizations, we find different groups to which this supreme loyalty is given. The modern period of history, starting with the French Revolution, is characterized by the fact that in this period, and in this period alone, the nation demands the supreme loyalty of man, that all men, not only certain individuals or classes, are drawn into this common loyalty, and that all civilizations (which up to this modern period followed their own, and frequently widely different, ways) are now dominated more and more by this one supreme group-consciousness, nationalism.

It is a fact often commented upon that this growth of nationalism and of national sectionalisms happened at the very time when international relations, trade, and communications were developing as never before; that local languages were raised to the dignity of literary and cultural languages just at the time when it seemed most desirable to efface all differences of language by the spread of world languages. This view overlooks the fact that that very growth of nationalism all over the earth, with its awakening of the masses to participation in political and cultural life, prepared the way for the closer cultural contacts of all the civilizations of mankind (now for the first time brought into a common denominator), at the same time separating and uniting them.

Nationalism as a group-consciousness is a psychological and a sociological fact, but any psychological or sociological explanation is insufficient. An American psychologist defined a nation as "a group of individuals that feels itself one, is ready within limits to sacrifice the individual for the group advantage, that prospers as a whole, that has groups of emotions experienced as a whole, each of whom rejoices with the advancement and suffers with the losses of the group. . . . Nationality is a mental state or community in behavior." This definition is valid, as far as it goes, not only for the nation, but for any other supreme group to which man owes loyalty, and with which he identifies himself. It is therefore not sufficient to distinguish the national group from other groups of similar importance and permanence.

Nationalities are the product of the historical development of society. They are not identical with clans, tribes, or folk-groups—bodies of men united by actual or supposed common descent or by a common habitat. Ethnographic groups like these existed throughout history, from earliest times on, yet they do not form nationalities; they are nothing but "ethnographic material," out of which under certain circumstances a nationality might arise. Even if a nationality arises, it may dis-

appear again, absorbed into a larger or new nationality. Nationalities are products of the living forces of history, and therefore always fluctuating, never rigid. Nationalities are groups of very recent origin and therefore are of the utmost complexity. They defy exact definition. Nationality is an historical and a political concept, and the words "nation" and "nationality" have undergone many changes in meaning. It is only in recent history that man has begun to regard nationality as the center of his political and cultural activity and life. Nationality is therefore nothing absolute, and it is a great mistake, responsible for most of the extremities of today, to make it an absolute, an objective *a priori*, the source of all political and cultural life.

Nationality has been raised to an absolute by two fictitious concepts which have been accepted as having real substance. One holds that blood or race is the basis of nationality, and that it exists eternally and carries with it an unchangeable inheritance; the other sees the *Volksgeist* as an ever-welling source of nationality and all its manifestations. These theories offer no real explanation of the rise and the role of nationality: they refer us to mythical prehistorical pseudo-realities. Rather, they must be taken as characteristic elements of thought in the age of nationalism, and are subject themselves to analysis by the historian of nationalism.

Nationalities come into existence only when certain objective bonds delimit a social group. A nationality generally has several of these attributes; very few have all of them. The most usual of them are common descent, language, territory, political entity, customs and traditions, and religion. A short discussion will suffice to show that none of them is essential to the existence or definition of nationality.

Common descent seemed of great importance to primitive man for whom birth was as great a mystery as death, and therefore was surrounded by legends and superstitions. Modern nationalities, however, are mixtures of different, and sometimes even very distant, races. The great migratory movements of history and the mobility of modern life have led everywhere to an intermingling, so that few if any nationalities can at present claim anything approaching common descent.

The importance of language for the formation and life of nationality was stressed by Herder and Fichte. But there are many nationalities who have no language of their own—like the Swiss, who speak four different languages, or the Latin American nationalities, all of whom speak Spanish or Portuguese. The English-speaking nations (also the Spanish-speaking) are partly of similar descent; they speak the same language, and had until quite recently the same historical background, and also

traditions and customs very much akin to each other; yet they represent different nationalities with frequently conflicting aspirations. Another example of the comparative irrelevance of objective criteria for the formation and continued existence of separate nationalities is to be found in Norway and Denmark, where the people are of common racial stock and speak almost the same language. Nevertheless they consider themselves as two nationalities, and the Norwegians set up their own language only as the result of having become a nationality.

Customs and traditions were first stressed in their importance for nationality by Rousseau. Each nation undoubtedly has its customs, traditions, and institutions; but these often vary greatly from locality to locality, and, on the other hand, tend in our times to become standardized all over the world, or at least over large areas. Customs and manners nowadays often change with great rapidity.

Religion was the great dominating force before the rise of nationalism in modern times. This is true in Western as well as Eastern Christianity, in Islam and in India. The dividing lines were not drawn according to nationalities, but according to religious civilizations. Therefore the rise of nationalities and of nationalism was accompanied by transformations in the religious attitude of man, and in many ways the growth of nationalities has been helped or hindered by the influence of religion. Religious differences sometimes divided and weakened nationalities, and even helped to create new nationalities, as in the case of the Catholic Croats and the Orthodox Serbs. On the other hand, national churches have frequently been an important element in helping to arouse nationalism; and when conflicting nationalities were of different religions religion often played a large part in the defense mechanism of the weaker nationality, as Catholicism did in Ireland and in Prussian Poland.

The most important outward factor in the formation of nationalities is a common territory, or rather, the state. Political frontiers tend to establish nationalities. Many new nationalities, like the Canadian, developed entirely because they formed a political and geographic entity. Generally we may say, for reasons which will be considered later, that statehood or nationhood (in the sense of common citizenship under one territorial government) is a constitutive element in the life of a nationality. The condition of statehood need not be present when a nationality originates; but in such a case (as with the Czechs in the late eighteenth century) it is always the memory of a past state and the aspiration toward statehood that characterizes nationalities in the period of nationalism.

Although some of these objective factors are of

great importance for the formation of nationalities, the most essential element is a living and active corporate will. Nationality is formed by the decision to form a nationality. Thus the French nationality was born of the enthusiastic manifestation of will in 1789. A French nation, the population of the French kingdom, existed before, as did some of the objective conditions necessary for the foundation of a nationality. But only the newly aroused consciousness and will made these elements active and effective, fused them into a source of immense centripetal power, and gave them a new importance and meaning. The English and the American nationalities were constituted by "covenants," by free acts of will, and the French Revolution evolved the plebiscite, as a result of which membership in a nationality was determined, not by objective characteristics, but by subjective declaration. The foundation of the Swiss nationality was dramatized by Friedrich Schiller in his *Wilhelm Tell* according to legendary tradition into the famous oath on the Rütli, "Wir wollen sein ein einig Volk von Brüdern." This mythical declaration, "We wish to be one single nation of brothers," was uttered at the birth of every nationality, whether this birth happened, after a long pregnancy, in the enthusiasm of a revolutionary period, or whether the awakening of the masses required many years of ceaseless propaganda. Nationalities as "ethnographic material," as "pragmatic" and accidental factors in history, existed for a very long time; but only through the awakening of national consciousness have they become volitional and "absolute" factors in history. The extensive use of the word "nationality" must not blind us to the fact that the lack of this voluntaristic element makes what are sometimes called nationalities of the period before the rise of modern nationalism fundamentally different from nationalities of the present time. To base nationality upon "objective" factors like race implies a return to primitive tribalism. In modern times it has been the power of an idea, not the call of blood, that has constituted and molded nationalities.

Nationalities are created out of ethnographic and political elements when nationalism breathes life into the form built by preceding centuries. Thus nationalism and nationality are closely interrelated. Nationalism is a state of mind, permeating the large majority of a people and claiming to permeate all its members; it recognizes the nation-state as the ideal form of political organization and the nationality as the source of all creative cultural energy and of economic well-being. The supreme loyalty of man is therefore due to his nationality, as his own life is supposedly rooted in and made possible by its welfare. A short discussion of the components of this definition will help to clarify the issues involved.

A state of mind of the large majority of the people: Even before the age of nationalism, we find individuals who profess sentiments akin to nationalism. But these sentiments are confined to individuals; the masses never feel their own life—culturally, politically, or economically—dependent upon the fate of the national group. Periods of oppression or danger from the outside may arouse a feeling of nationalism in the masses, as it happened in Greece during the Persian wars or in France in the Hundred Years' War. But these sentiments pass quickly. As a rule, wars before the French Revolution did not arouse a deep national sentiment. In religious and dynastic wars, Germans fought against Germans, and Italians against Italians, without any realization of the "fratricidal" nature of the act. Soldiers and civilians entered the service of "foreign" rulers and served them often with a loyalty and faithfulness which proved the absence of any national sentiment.

The nation-state as the ideal form of political organization: That political boundaries should coincide with ethnographic or linguistic frontiers is a demand of recent times. Formerly, the city or the fief or a multilingual state held together by dynastic ties was the accepted form of political organization and frequently was regarded as the "natural" or ideal form. At other periods the educated classes as well as the masses believed in the ideal of a universal world-state, although on account of the technical and geographic conditions this ideal never approached realization.

The nationality as the source of cultural life: During most of historical time, religion was regarded as the true source of cultural life. Man was thought to become creative by his profound immersion in religious tradition and by his abandonment in the divine fountainhead of all being. At other times, man's education was steeped in the civilization of a class which spread beyond all national boundaries, like the civilization of knighthood in medieval Europe or of the French court in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

During and after the Renaissance, man's education was rooted in the soil of classical civilization. Education and learning, the formation of man's mind and character, were not bound by any national limits.

The nationality as a source of economic well-being: This phase of nationalism, as well as the political, was prepared by the period of absolute monarchy, with its mercantilism. But mercantilism never became more than a scheme imposed from above, trying to achieve a national unity which it in reality never approached; continuing in many ways the medieval confusion and disruption of economic life and leaving provinces, cities, and villages as centers of production. The purpose of mercantilism was to strengthen the state and its power in international politics. The system following mercantilism, in the period of *laissez faire*, had as its aim the promotion of individual welfare. Economic nationalism brought about a neo-mercantilism, filling with life, as had been the case with the centralized state, the form erected by the monarchs. It is a much younger development than political or cultural nationalism, and it holds that the well-being of the individual can be achieved and secured only by the economic power of the nations. The close political and cultural identification of the individual with his nationality, which took place at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century, extended to the economic field only during the latter part of the nineteenth century.

The supreme loyalty due to the nationality: The Austrian Monarchy was generally accepted as long as man's supreme loyalty was due to the legitimate king; its existence became precarious with the shift of loyalty from the dynasty to the nationality. Only a very few centuries ago, man's loyalty was due to his church or religion; a heretic put himself beyond the pale of society as a "traitor" to his nation does today. The fixation of man's supreme loyalty upon his nationality marks the beginning of the age of nationalism.

Part II.

THE PATH TO INDEPENDENCE

As Kohn declares, "Periods of oppression or danger from the outside may arouse a feeling of nationalism in the masses." In America, the interval between 1765 and 1776 was such a period. At the beginning of that decade, the dominant loyalty of America was a loyalty to the British Empire, and the primary link among the colonies was their common allegiance to the British Crown. President Ezra Stiles of Yale was later to remark upon "the antient national affection which we once had for the parent state, while we gloried in being part of the British empire." Similarly, John Adams spoke of "the commonplace images of mother country and children colonies," and Benjamin Franklin wrote a song:

"Know too ye bad neighbors, who aim to divide,
The sons from the mother that still she's our pride,

And if ye attack her, we're all on her side,
Which nobody can deny, deny,
Which nobody can deny."

But from the time of the adoption of the Stamp Act, a constant series of antagonisms dimmed and finally extinguished this loyalty. Aside from the chronic question of oppressive taxation, there were also problems arising from the Proclamation Line (1763), which prevented pioneer settlement beyond the Alleghenies; from the limitation of jury trial through the use of admiralty courts; from the quartering of Redcoats in American homes; and from other causes. From Massachusetts to Georgia, colonists resented the imperial policy. They burned with indignation at the accounts (grossly exaggerated) of the Boston Massacre, and when in 1773 Parliament passed the Intolerable Acts to punish Massachusetts for the Boston Tea Party, the Americans felt that the liberty of every colony was threatened.

Later, when the antagonisms of the time burst into open fighting, loyalty to Britain was placed under the ultimate strain. For a surprisingly long time it persisted, and the officers of Washington's army continued to drink the King's health while fighting the King's troops. But American resentment at the use of hired German soldiers, added to the feelings naturally produced by war, led to the decision, in 1776, to make a complete break. The Declaration of Independence was the result.

All of this development had been accompanied by an emphasis on the grievances of the colonies as afflictions common to all, and upon the necessity for common action. Very often, when measures deemed oppressive were applied in one colony, citizen groups in other colonies would assemble to vote resolutions of protest. This impulse toward solidarity also manifested itself in a far more significant way—in a series of general congresses of delegates from all, or at least most, of the colonies. The Stamp Act Congress of 1765, in which nine colonies were represented, was the first of these. For the nine years following, there was no such meeting, and the only means of joint action was through Committees of Correspondence in the various colonies, but after the passage of the Intolerable Acts, a new gathering of delegates—from twelve colonies this time—met at Philadelphia in 1774 as the First Continental Congress. The Second Continental Congress, with thirteen colonies represented, assembled in the following spring. When it did so, fighting had begun, and it fell to this body to prosecute the war, which was the longest in American history. It was also the Second Continental Congress which made the final break with Britain by declaring independence in 1776.

Intercolonial solidarity in voicing common complaints, or even in waging war against the common enemy, was not necessarily the same thing as American nationalism. But it was a vital step toward American nationalism, just as it was a vital step away from loyalty to the Empire. If it did not, in itself, constitute a shift of loyalties, it created a new organization around which loyalties might be expected to cluster. As a preliminary to examining the loyalties of Americans in the Revolutionary period, therefore, it will pay to examine some documents which illustrate (A) the growing conviction among the colonists that they were associated in a common cause, and (B) the growing demand for independence.

A.

THE REVOLUTION AS A COMMON CAUSE

1. *Extracts from Resolutions Adopted by a Public Meeting at Philadelphia on June 18, 1774.*² At the time these resolutions were passed, the people of Boston had resisted the Tea Tax by dumping cargoes of tea into Boston harbor, and the British government had attempted to punish them by a series of measures known as the Coercive or Intolerable Acts. These acts decreased the amount of self-government in Massachusetts, permitted the removal of trial of royal officials to England, revived the practice of quartering troops, and closed the port of Boston to shipping.

PROCEEDINGS OF FREEHOLDERS AND FREEMEN OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA, HELD ON SATURDAY JUNE 18th, 1774, ON THE BOSTON PORT-BILL.

I. *Resolved*, That the act of parliament, for shutting up the port of Boston, is unconstitutional; oppressive to the inhabitants of that town; dangerous to the liberties of the British colonies; and that therefore, we consider our brethren, at Boston, as suffering in the common cause of America.

II. That a congress of deputies from the several colonies, in North America, is the most probable

and proper mode of procuring relief for our suffering brethren, obtaining redress of American grievances, securing our rights and liberties, and re-establishing peace and harmony between Great Britain and these colonies on a constitutional foundation.

III. That a large and respectable committee be immediately appointed for the city and county of Philadelphia, to correspond with their sister colonies and with the several counties in this province, in order that all may unite in promoting and endeavoring to attain the great and valuable ends, mentioned in the foregoing resolution.

2. *Extracts from Resolutions Adopted by a Public Meeting at New York on July 6, 1774.*³

The circumstances leading to these resolutions were the same as those which caused the adoption of the resolutions at Philadelphia.

At a numerous meeting of the inhabitants of the city of New-York, convened in the fields, by a public advertisement, on Wednesday the 6th of July, 1774, Mr. Alexander M'Dougall, Chairman—

The business of the meeting being fully explained by the chairman, and the dangerous tendency of the numerous and vile arts used by the enemies of America, to divide and distract her councils, as well as the misrepresentations of the virtuous intentions of the citizens of this metropolis, in this interesting and alarming state of the liberties of America, the following resolutions were twice read, and the question being separately put on each of them, they were passed without one dissenter.

1st. Resolved, *nem. con.* [unanimously] That the statute commonly called the Boston port act, is oppressive to the inhabitants of that town, unconstitutional in its principles, and dangerous to the liberties of British America; and that, therefore, we consider our brethren at Boston, as now suffering in the common cause of these colonies.

2d. Resolved. *nem. con.* That any attack or attempt to abridge the liberties, or invade the constitution, of any of our sister colonies, is immediately an attack upon the liberties and constitution of all the British colonies.

3d. Resolved. *nem. con.* That the shutting up of any of the ports in America, with intent to exact from Americans, a submission to Parliamentary taxations, or extort a reparation of private injuries, is highly unconstitutional, and subversive of the commercial rights of the inhabitants of this continent.

4th. Resolved. *nem. con.* That it is the opinion of this meeting, that if the principal colonies on this continent shall come into a joint resolution to stop all importation from, and exportation to Great Britain, till the Act of Parliament for blocking up the harbour of Boston be repealed, the

same will prove the salvation of North America and her liberties, and that, on the other hand, if they continue their exports and imports, there is great reason to fear that fraud, power, and the most odious oppression, will rise triumphant over right, justice, social happiness, and freedom:—Therefore,

5th. Resolved. *nem. con.* That the deputies who shall represent this colony in the Congress of American deputies, to be held at Philadelphia, about the first of September next, are hereby instructed, empowered, and directed to engage with a majority of the principal colonies, to agree, for this city, upon a non-importation from Great Britain, of all goods, wares and merchandises, until the act for blocking up the harbour of Boston be repealed, and American grievances be redressed; and also to agree to all such other measures as the congress shall, in their wisdom, judge advansive of these great objects, and a general security of the rights and privileges of America.

3. *The Declaration of Rights and Grievances.*

The two principal accomplishments of the First Continental Congress were the adoption of a Declaration of Rights and Grievances, October 14, 1774, and the formation of a very effective Association to prevent the importation of British goods until American wrongs should be redressed. Extracts from the Declaration follow.⁴

. . . And whereas, in the last session of Parliament, three statutes were made . . . [the Boston Port Act, the Massachusetts Government Act, the Administration of Justice Act], and another statute was then made [the Quebec Act] . . . All which statutes are impolitic, unjust, and cruel, as well as unconstitutional, and most dangerous and destructive of American rights.

And whereas, Assemblies have been frequently dissolved, contrary to the rights of the people, when they attempted to deliberate on grievances; and their dutiful, humble, loyal & reasonable petitions to the crown for redress, have been repeatedly treated with contempt, by his majesty's ministers of state:

The good people of the several Colonies of New-hampshire, Massachusetts-bay, Rhode-island and Providence plantations, Connecticut, New-York, New-Jersey, Pennsylvania, Newcastle, Kent and Sussex on Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, justly alarmed at these arbitrary proceedings of parliament and administration, have severally elected, constituted, and appointed deputies to meet and sit in general congress, in the city of Philadelphia, in order to obtain such establishment, as that their religion, laws, and liberties may not be subverted:

Whereupon the deputies so appointed being now assembled, in a full and free representation of these Colonies, taking into their most serious consideration, the best means of attaining the ends aforesaid, do, in the first place, as Englishmen, their ancestors in like cases have usually done, for asserting and vindicating their rights and liberties, declare,

That the inhabitants of the English Colonies in North America, by the immutable laws of nature, the principles of the English constitution, and the several charters or compacts, have the following Rights:

Resolved, N. C. D.

1. That they are entitled to life, liberty, & property, and they have never ceded to any sovereign power whatever, a right to dispose of either without their consent.

2. That our ancestors, who first settled these colonies, were at the time of their emigration from the mother country, entitled to all the rights, liberties, and immunities of free and natural-born subjects, within the realm of England.

3. That by such emigration they by no means forfeited, surrendered, or lost any of those rights, but that they were, and their descendants now are entitled to the exercise and enjoyment of all such of them, as their local and other circumstances enable them to exercise and enjoy.

4. That the foundation of English liberty, and of all free government, is a right in the people to participate in their legislative council: and as the English colonists are not represented, and from their local and other circumstances, cannot properly be represented in the British parliament, they are entitled to a free and exclusive power of legislation in their several provincial legislatures, where their right of representation can alone be preserved, in all cases of taxation and internal polity, subject only to the negative of their sovereign, in such manner as has been heretofore used and accustomed. But, from the necessity of the case, and a regard to the mutual interest of both countries, we cheerfully consent to the operation of such acts of the British parliament, as are bona fide, restrained to the regulation of our external commerce, for the purpose of securing the commercial advantages of the whole empire to the mother country, and the commercial benefits of its respective members; excluding every idea of taxation, internal or external, for raising a revenue on the subjects in America, without their consent.

4. *The Non-importation Agreement, October 20, 1774.* In connection with this document, called the "Association," adopted by the Continental Congress, it is interesting to observe that when Lincoln delivered his first inaugu-

ral address on March 4, 1861, with a number of Southern states declaring themselves out of the Union, he denied their right to secede, asserted that the Union is perpetual, and concluded: "we find the proposition that in legal contemplation the Union is perpetual confirmed by the history of the Union itself. The Union is much older than the Constitution. It was formed, in fact, by the Articles of Association in 1774. It was matured and continued by the Declaration of Independence in 1776. It was further matured, and the faith of all the then thirteen States expressly plighted and engaged that it should be perpetual, by the Articles of Confederation in 1778. And finally, in 1787, one of the declared objects for ordaining and establishing the Constitution was 'to form a more perfect Union.' " 5

We, his majesty's most loyal subjects, the delegates of the several colonies of New-Hampshire, Massachusetts-Bay, Rhode-Island, Connecticut, New-York, New-Jersey, Pennsylvania, the three lower counties of New-Castle, Kent and Sussex, on Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North-Carolina, and South-Carolina, deputed to represent them in a continental Congress, held in the city of Philadelphia, on the 5th day of September, 1774, avowing our allegiance to his majesty, our affection and regard for our fellow-subjects in Great-Britain and elsewhere, affected with the deepest anxiety, and most alarming apprehensions, at those grievances and distresses, with which his Majesty's American subjects are oppressed; and having taken under our most serious deliberation, the state of the whole continent, find, that the present unhappy situation of our affairs is occasioned by a ruinous system of colony administration, adopted by the British ministry about the year 1763, evidently calculated for enslaving these colonies, and, with them, the British empire. In prosecution of which system, various acts of parliament have been passed, for raising a revenue in America, for depriving the American subjects, in many instances, of the constitutional trial by jury, exposing their lives to danger, by directing a new and illegal trial beyond the seas, for crimes alleged to have been committed in America: and in prosecution of the same system, several late, cruel, and oppressive acts have been passed, respecting the town of Boston and the Massachusetts-Bay, and also an act for extending the province of Quebec, so as to border on the western frontiers of these colonies, establishing an arbitrary government therein, and discouraging the settlement of British subjects in that wide extended country; thus, by the influence of civil principles and ancient prejudices, to dispose the inhabitants to act with hostility against

the free Protestant colonies, whenever a wicked ministry shall chuse so to direct them.

To obtain redress of these grievances, which threaten destruction to the lives, liberty, and property of his majesty's subjects, in North America, we are of opinion, that a non-importation, non-consumption, and non-exportation agreement, faithfully adhered to, will prove the most speedy, effectual, and peaceable measure: And, therefore, we do, for ourselves, and the inhabitants of the several colonies, whom we represent, firmly agree and associate, under the sacred ties of virtue, honour and love of our country, as follows:

1. That from and after the first day of December next, we will not import, into British America, from Great-Britain or Ireland, any goods, wares, or merchandise whatsoever, or from any other place, any such goods, wares, or merchandise, as shall have been exported from Great-Britain or Ireland; nor will we, after that day, import any East-India tea from any part of the world; nor any molasses, syrups, paneles, coffee, or pimento, from the British plantations or from Dominica; nor wines from Madeira, or the Western Islands; nor foreign indigo.

2. We will neither import nor purchase, any slave imported after the first day of December next; after which time, we will wholly discontinue the slave trade, and will neither be concerned in it ourselves, nor will we hire our vessels, nor sell our commodities or manufactures to those who are concerned in it. . . .

5. *The Impact of War.* Neither the protests of the Declaration of Rights and Grievances nor the boycott of the Association caused Britain to recognize American claims. Instead, tensions grew, and in April, 1775, fighting broke out at Lexington and Concord. When, therefore, the Second Continental Congress met in May, 1775, war was in progress, and resistance could not continue unless the Congress was prepared to raise an army and prosecute the war. Congress accepted this challenge, and in doing so, adopted, on July 6, 1775, a Declaration of the Causes and Necessity of Taking up Arms.⁶

Our forefathers, inhabitants of the island of Great Britain, left their native land, to seek on these shores a residence for civil and religious freedom. At the expence of their blood, at the hazard of their fortunes, without the least charge to the country from which they removed, by unceasing labor, and an unconquerable spirit, they effected settlements in the distant and inhospitable wilds of America, then filled with numerous and warlike nations of barbarians. Societies or governments, vested with perfect legislatures, were formed under

charters from the crown, and an harmonious intercourse was established between the colonies and the kingdom from which they derived their origin. The mutual benefits of this union became in a short time so extraordinary, as to excite astonishment. It is universally confessed, that the amazing increase of the wealth, strength, and navigation of the realm, arose from this source; and the minister, who so wisely and successfully directed the measures of Great Britain in the late war, publicly declared, that these colonies enabled her to triumph over her enemies.—Towards the conclusion of that war, it pleased our sovereign to make a change in his counsels.—From that fatal moment, the affairs of the British empire began to fall into confusion, and gradually sliding from the summit of glorious prosperity, to which they had been advanced by the virtues and abilities of one man, are at length distracted by the convulsions, that now shake it to its deepest foundations.

[A long complaint follows, enumerating various measures of the British government which are considered hostile to American welfare.]

We are reduced to the alternative of chusing an unconditional submission to the tyranny of irritated ministers, or resistance by force.—The latter is our choice.—We have counted the cost of this contest, and find nothing so dreadful as voluntary slavery.—Honor, justice, and humanity, forbid us tamely to surrender that freedom which we received from our gallant ancestors, and which our innocent posterity have a right to receive from us. We cannot endure the infamy and guilt of resigning succeeding generations to that wretchedness which inevitably awaits them, if we basely entail hereditary bondage upon them.

Our cause is just. Our union is perfect. Our internal resources are great, and, if necessary, foreign assistance is undoubtedly attainable.—We gratefully acknowledge, as signal instances of the Divine favour towards us, that his Providence would not permit us to be called into this severe controversy, until we were grown up to our present strength, had been previously exercised in warlike operation, and possessed of the means of defending ourselves.—With hearts fortified with these animating reflections, we most solemnly, before God and the world, declare, that, exerting the utmost energy of those powers, which our beneficent Creator hath graciously bestowed upon us, the arms we have been compelled by our enemies to assume, we will in defiance of every hazard, with unabating firmness and perseverance, employ for the preservation of our liberties; being with one mind resolved to dye Free-men rather than to live Slaves.

Lest this declaration should disquiet the minds of our friends and fellow-subjects in any part of the empire, we assure them that we mean not to

dissolve that Union which has so long and so happily subsisted between us, and which we sincerely wish to see restored.—Necessity has not yet driven us into that desperate measure, or induced

us to excite any other nation to war against them.—We have not raised armies with ambitious designs of separating from Great Britain, and establishing independent states.

B. THE FINAL BREAK WITH THE EMPIRE

So long as the colonies planned to redress their wrongs by resistance within the Empire, they could regard their own arrangements for common action as purely temporary. But the very suggestion of independence implicitly carried with it a question whether the colonies would become separately independent as thirteen entities, or collectively independent as a single union of states. Spokesmen of independence usually did not take a clear cut position on this question, but the selections that follow throw some light upon their intentions in this matter.

1. *Common Sense*, by Thomas Paine, appeared as a pamphlet on January 10, 1776. Before the end of that winter, more than 100,000 copies had been circulated. It was undoubtedly, therefore, a vital force in shaping Revolutionary opinion, and it spoke boldly for independence. At the beginning of the selection, Paine is speaking of the importance of the Revolutionary cause.⁷

The Sun never shined on a cause of greater worth. 'Tis not the affair of a City, a County, a Province, or a Kingdom; but of a Continent—of at least one eighth part of the habitable Globe. 'Tis not the concern of a day, a year, or an age; posterity are virtually involved in the contest, and will be more or less affected even to the end of time, by the proceedings now. Now is the seed-time of Continental union, faith, and honour. The least fracture now will be like a name engraved with the point of a pin on the tender rind of a young oak; the wound would enlarge with the tree, and posterity read it in full grown characters.

By referring the matter from argument to arms, a new aera for politics is struck—a new method of thinking hath arisen. All plans, proposals, &c., prior to the nineteenth of April, *i.e.* to the commencement of hostilities [at Lexington], are like the almanacks of the last year; which tho' proper then, are superceded and useless now. Whatever was advanced by the advocates on either side of the question then, terminated in one and the same point, *viz.* a union with Great Britain; the only difference between the parties was the method of effecting it; the one proposing force, the other friendship; but it hath so far happened that the first hath failed, and the second hath withdrawn her influence.

As much hath been said of the advantages of reconciliation, which, like an agreeable dream, hath passed away and left us as we were, it is but right that we should examine the contrary side of

the argument, and enquire into some of the many material injuries which these Colonies sustain, and always will sustain, by being connected with and dependant on Great-Britain. To examine that connection and dependance, on the principles of nature and common sense, to see what we have to trust to, if separated, and what we are to expect, if dependant.

I have heard it asserted by some, that as America has flourished under her former connection with Great-Britain, the same connection is necessary towards her future happiness, and will always have the same effect. Nothing can be more fallacious than this kind of argument. We may as well assert that because a child has thrived upon milk, that it is never to have meat, or that the first twenty years of our lives is to become a precedent for the next twenty. But even this is admitting more than is true; for I answer roundly, that America would have flourished as much, and probably much more, had no European power taken any notice of her. The commerce by which she hath enriched herself are the necessities of life, and will always have a market while eating is the custom of Europe.

But she has protected us, say some. That she hath engrossed us is true, and defended the Continent at our expense as well as her own, is admitted; and she would have defended Turkey from the same motive, *viz.* for the sake of trade and dominion.

Alas! we have been long led away by ancient prejudices and made large sacrifices to superstition. We have boasted the protection of Great Britain, without considering, that her motive was *interest not attachment*; and that she did not protect us from *our enemies on our account*; but from *her enemies on her own account*, from those who had no quarrel with us on any *other account*, and who will always be our enemies on the *same account*. Let Britain waive her pretensions to the Continent, or the Continent throw off the depend

ance, and we should be at peace with France and Spain, were they at war with Britain. The miseries of Hanover's last war ought to warn us against connections.

It hath lately been asserted in parliament, that the Colonies have no relation to each other but through the Parent Country, *i.e.* that Pennsylvania and the Jerseys, and so on for the rest, are sister Colonies by the way of England; this is certainly a very roundabout way of proving relationship, but it is the nearest and only true way of proving enmity (or enemyship, if I may so call it.) France and Spain never were, nor perhaps ever will be, our enemies as *Americans*, but as our being the *subjects of Great Britain*.

But Britain is the parent country, say some. Then the more shame upon her conduct. Even brutes do not devour their young, nor savages make war upon their families; Wherefore, the assertion, if true, turns to her reproach; but it happens not to be true, or only partly so, and the phrase *parent* or *mother country* hath been jesuitically adopted by the King and his parasites, with a low papistical design of gaining an unfair bias on the credulous weakness of our minds. Europe, and not England, is the parent country of America. This new World hath been the asylum for the persecuted lovers of civil and religious liberty from *every part* of Europe. Hither have they fled, not from the tender embraces of the mother, but from the cruelty of the monster; and it is so far true of England, that the same tyranny which drove the first emigrants from home, pursues their descendants still.

In this extensive quarter of the globe, we forget the narrow limits of three hundred and sixty miles (the extent of England) and carry our friendship on a larger scale; we claim brotherhood with every European Christian, and triumph in the generosity of the sentiment.

It is pleasant to observe by what regular gradations we surmount the force of local prejudices, as we enlarge our acquaintance with the World. A man born in any town in England divided into parishes, will naturally associate most with his fellow parishioners (because their interests in many cases will be common) and distinguish him by the name of *neighbour*; if he meet him but a few miles from home, he drops the narrow idea of a street, and salutes him by the name of *townsman*; if he travel out of the county and meet him in any other, he forgets the minor divisions of street and town, and calls him *countryman*, *i.e.* *countyman*: but if in their foreign excursions they should associate in France, or any other part of *Europe*, their local remembrance would be enlarged into that of *Englishmen*. And by a just parity of reasoning, all Europeans meeting in America, or any other quarter of the globe, are *countrymen*; for

England, Holland, Germany, or Sweden, when compared with the whole, stand in the same places on the larger scale, which the divisions of street, town, and county do on the smaller ones; Distinctions too limited for Continental minds. Not one third of the inhabitants, even of this province, [Pennsylvania], are of English descent. Wherefore, I reprobate the phrase of Parent or Mother Country applied to England only, as being false, selfish, narrow and ungenerous.

2. *Opinion in a New England Town.* On May 27, 1776, residents of the town of Malden, Massachusetts, voted to instruct their delegate in the Continental Congress as to their views on Independence.⁸

... we are confirmed in the opinion, that the present age will be deficient in their duty to God, their posterity and themselves, if they do not establish an American republic. This is the only form of government which we wish to see established; for we can never be willingly subject to any other King than he who, being possessed of infinite wisdom, goodness and rectitude, is alone fit to possess unlimited power.

We have freely spoken our sentiments upon this important subject, but we mean not to dictate; we have unbounded confidence in the wisdom and uprightness of the continental congress: with pleasure we recollect that this affair is under their direction and we now instruct you, sir, to give them the strongest assurance that, if they should declare America to be a free and independent republic, your constituents would support and defend the measure, to the last drop of their blood, and the last farthing of their treasure.

3. *The Declaration of Independence.* Adopted by the Second Continental Congress on July 2, 1776, and signed by the delegates on July 4.⁹

THE UNANIMOUS DECLARATION OF THE THIRTEEN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the Powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That, to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the consent of the governed.

That, whenever any form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such Principles, and organizing its Powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and, accordingly, all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But, when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future Security. Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world.

[The statement of causes which led the American colonies to declare their independence follows, and constitutes the bulk of the Declaration. The document concludes . . .]

We, therefore, the Representatives of the united States of America, in General Congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the World for the rectitude of our intentions, DO, in the Name, and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly Publish and Declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right, ought to be *Free and Independent States*; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connexion between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as Free and Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do. And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the Protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honour.

4. *The Declaration Endorsed.* After the Declaration was adopted by Congress, it was transmitted to the separate states. In ten of the states, the governor promptly and publicly issued a proclamation announcing independence, and in three of these ten, the legislature of the state passed resolutions confirming the

action of the Congress. In one state, New York, the delegates in the Congress had refused to vote on the Declaration, and it had to be approved by a separate act of the New York legislature. In two others, Connecticut and Rhode Island, the governor refrained from proclaiming the Declaration until after it had been acted upon by the legislature. In Connecticut, the legislature did not convene until October 10, 1776, at which time a number of resolutions were adopted. A law was enacted to define and punish treason either against Connecticut or against the United States, and a citizen's oath was prescribed requiring a specific pledge of loyalty to Connecticut, but none to the United States. Prior to either of these, a resolution had been voted confirming the Declaration of Independence.¹⁰

Whereas George the third, King of Great Britain, hath unjustly levied war against this and the other united States of America, declared them out of his protection, and abdicated the government of this State, whereby the good people of this State are absolved from their allegiance and subjection to the crown of Great Britain: And whereas the Representatives of the said United States in General Congress assembled have published and declared that these United States are and of right ought to be free and independent States, and that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown:

Resolved by this Assembly, That they approve of the Declaration of Independence published by said Congress, and that this Colony is and of right ought to be a free and independent State, and the inhabitants thereof are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and all political connections between them and the King of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved.

5. *The Declaration Interpreted.* One of the earliest recorded debates as to the meaning of the Declaration of Independence took place in the Constitutional Convention on June 19, 1787. Luther Martin of Maryland and James Wilson of Pennsylvania were debating whether the states with greater population should also have greater representation in the new government. The account of their exchange is from James Madison's notes.¹¹

Mr. MARTIN, said he considered that the separation from G[reat] B[ritain] placed the 13 States in a state of Nature towards each other; that they would have remained in that state till this time, but for the confederation; that they entered into the confederation on the footing of equality; that they met now to amend it on the same footing;

and that he could never accede to a plan that would introduce an inequality and lay 10 States at the mercy of Va. Massts. and Penna.

Mr. WILSON, could not admit the doctrine that when the Colonies became independent of G[reat] Britain, they became independent also of each other. He read the declaration of Inde-

pendence, observing thereon that the *United Colonies* were declared to be free & independent States; and inferring that they were independent, not *individually* but *Unitedly* and that they were confederated as they were independent, States.

Col. [Alexander] HAMILTON, assented to the doctrine of Mr. Wilson.

Part III. THE LOYALTIES OF REVOLUTIONARY AMERICA

If nationalism could be measured in objective terms, by some political act such as the adoption of a constitution or the inauguration of a government, the origin and existence of an American nation would be less difficult to trace. But since it must be sought in terms of the factors which Kohn has discussed, and especially in terms of group feeling, the beginnings of American nationality cannot be exactly fixed, and have been the subject of prolonged dispute. One view holds that the Declaration of Independence marked the birth of an American Nation in 1776; that is precisely what Abraham Lincoln meant to assert at Gettysburg in 1863 when he declared that "Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in Liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." But this view has never been universally accepted, either in Lincoln's time or our own, and there is an opposing view, well expressed in the statement of a leading historian who declared that the Revolution was carried on by "thirteen independent states which were temporarily acting together in the business of acquiring their individual independence."¹²

Basically, this involves the question of whether the republic was formed by a single American nationalism or a cluster of separate nationalisms. It is a question which has been much disputed, and the disputants usually have sought to prove their points by analyzing the structure of government, to show that "sovereignty" lies with the central government, or with the separate states. This governmental aspect, with its emphasis on precise legal concepts, is a valid part of the question and one that cannot be avoided. But before narrowing the question to such refined points, it is well to recall that in its relation to the nationalistic impulse, government is a result rather than a cause. Since nationalism grows out of the factors which create a sense of group-consciousness its basic condition is not legal but psychological. Were these factors operating to transfer the old Empire loyalty to a number of separate colonies, now become states, or to a "Continental" America as a whole? Did the patriotic phrases about "brethren," "perfect Union," and the like, square with the facts? When men of the Revolution spoke of "my country" what country did they really mean? On these questions, the evidence is endless, and, in the nature of the problem, could not be conclusive, but the selections will suggest some of the tendencies that have to be taken into account.

A. THE FORCES OF DIVISION

It was natural that when the colonists discussed their grievances against the mother country, they emphasized in every way possible their complete identity with one another in this cause. Consequently, protests against British action produced some of the earliest expressions of Americanism. Christopher Gadsden at the Stamp Act Congress in 1765 exclaimed, "There ought to be no New England man; no New Yorker, known on the continent, but all of us Americans." In language that is astonishingly similar, Patrick Henry, nine years later, in the First Continental Congress, declared, "The distinctions between Virginians, Pennsylvanians, New Yorkers, and New Englanders are no more. I am not a Virginian but an American. . . . All distinctions are thrown down. All America is thrown into one mass."

Statements like these are important steps on the road to nationalism, but they cannot be

taken at face value, and were hardly intended to be. Patrick Henry remained very much a Virginian, as later selections will show. It becomes a matter of closely discriminating judgment, therefore, to arrive at any conclusion as to how far the impulse of continental unity eclipsed the divisive impulses of local attachment, based on an awareness of local differences. The selections that follow are designed to show both the degree of these differences, and what the differences were about. Once again, in view of Kohn's criteria of "common descent, language, territory, political entity, customs and tradition, and religion," what indications do the selections give as to the similarity or dissimilarity of the colonies?

1. *A Jerseyman on Virginia.* In 1773, a young graduate of Princeton, Philip Fithian by name, was offered a position as tutor to the children of Robert Carter, of Nomini Hall in Virginia. As a native of Cohansey, New Jersey, and a devout Presbyterian, Fithian found Virginia unlike his home in many respects. Even in speech there were differences which he described in his diary, saying, "The people here [in Virginia] pronounce Shower 'Sho-er'—And what in New-Jersey we call a Vendue here they call a 'Sale'—All Taverns they call 'Ordinary's'—When a Horse is frolicsome & brisk, they say at once he is 'gayly'—she is mischievous, they call him 'vicious.' " After a year in Virginia, he gave up his position as tutor, and another young Princetonian was appointed in his place. To his successor, Fithian wrote a long and valuable letter advising him of some of the differences between New Jersey and Virginia.¹³

When you have thought of removing, for a Time, out of the Colony in which you was born, & in which you have hitherto constantly resided, I make no doubt but you have at the same time expected to find a very considerable alteration of manners, among your new acquaintances, & some peculiarities toto Coelo different, from any you have before been accustomed to. Such a thought is natural; And you will if you come into Virginia, in much shorter time than a year, be convinced that it is just. In New-Jersey Government throughout, but especially in the Counties where you have any personal acquaintance, Gentlemen in the first rank of Dignity & Quality, of the Council, general Assembly, inferior Magistrates, Clergy-men, or independent Gentlemen, without the smallest fear of bringing any manner of reproach either on their office, or their high-born, long recorded Families associate freely & commonly with Farmers & Mechanicks tho' they be poor & industrious. Ingenuity & industry are the Strongest, & most approved recommendations to a Man in that Colony. The manners of the People seem to me, (probably I am overborn by the force of prejudice in favour of my native Soil), to bear some considerable resemblance of the manners in the ancient Spartan Commonwealth—The Valour of its Inhabitants—was the

best, & only security of that State against the enemy; & the wise laws of its renowned Legislator were the powerful Cement which kept them firm & invincible—In our Government, the laborious part of Men, who are commonly ranked in the midling or lower Class, are accounted the strength & Honour of the Colony; & the encouragement they receive from Gentlemen in the highest stations is the spring of Industry, next to their private advantage. The Levil which is admired in New-Jersey Government, among People of every rank, arises, no doubt, from the very great division of the lands in that Province, & consequently from the near approach to an equality of Wealth among the Inhabitants, since it is not famous for trade. You know very well that the Lands in a small township are divided, & then again subdivided into two & three Hundred Separate, proper, creditable estates; for example *Deerfield & Fairfield* two Townships, or Precincts, in which you & I are tolerably well acquainted, in the former of which, are the Seats of two Judges of the Sessions; & in the latter resides one of the representatives in General Assembly for the County; But if 16000£ would purchase the whole landed estates of these three Gentlemen, who are supposed to be the most wealthy in the County, if we rate their Land at the Low Consideration of 4£ pr acre, with all conveniences, each would have 4000 Acres. Now you may suppose how small a quantity many must have when two or three hundred Landholders reside in each of these small Precincts; Hence we see Gentlemen, when they are not actually engaged in the publick Service, on their farms, setting a laborious example to their Domesticks, & on the other hand we see labourers at the Tables & in the Parlours of their Betters enjoying the advantage, & honour of their society and Conversation—I do not call it an objection to this, that some few, who have no substance but work like Slaves as necessity drives them for a few Months in the year; with the price of this Labour they visit Philadelphia; & having there acquired a fashionable Coat, & a Stock of Impudence, return home to spend the remainder of the year, in idleness & disgrace!—But you will find the tables turned the moment you enter this Colony. The very Slaves, in some families here, could not be bought under 30000£. Such amazing property, no matter how deep it is involved, blows up the

owners to an imagination, which is visible in all, but in various degrees according to their respective virtue, that they are exalted as much above other Men in worth & precedency, as blind stupid fortune has made a difference in their property; excepting always the value they put upon posts of honour, & mental acquirements—For example, if you should travel through this Colony, with a well-confirmed testimonial of your having finished with Credit a Course of studies at Nassau-Hall; you would be rated, without any more questions asked, either about your family, your Estate, your business, or your intention, at 10,000£; and you might come, & go, & converse, & keep company, according to this value; and you would be despised and slighted if you rated yourself a farthing cheaper.

In this place I think it needful to caution you against hasty and ill founded prejudices. When you enter among a people, & find that their manner of living, their *Eating, Drinking, Diversions, Exercise, &c.* are in many respects different from any thing you have been accustomed to, you will be apt to fix your opinion in an instant, & (as some divines deal with poor Sinners) you will condemn all before you without any meaning or distinction what seems in your judgment disagreeable at first view, when you are smitten with the novelty. You will be making ten thousand Comparisons. The face of the Country, The *Soil*, the *Buildings*, the *Slaves*, the *Tobacco*, the method of spending *Sunday* among Christians; *Ditto* among the Negroes; the three grand divisions of time at the Church on Sundays, *Viz.* before Service giving & receiving letters of business, reading Advertisements, consulting about the price of Tobacco, Grain &c. & settling either the lineage, Age, or qualities of favourite Horses. In the Church at Service, prayers read over in haste, a Sermon seldom under & never over twenty minutes, but always made up of sound morality, or deep studied Metaphysics. After Service is over three quarters of an hour spent in strolling round the Church among the Crowd, in which time you will be invited by several different Gentlemen home with them to dinner. The Balls, the Fish-Feasts, the Dancing-Schools, the Christnings, the Cock fights, the Horse-Races, the Chariots, the Ladies Masked, for it is a custom among the Westmorland Ladies whenever they go from home, to muffle up their heads, & Necks, leaving only a narrow passage for the Eyes, in Cotton or silk handkerchiefs; I was in distress for them when I first came into the Colony, for every Woman that I saw abroad, I looked upon as ill either with the *Mumps* or Tooth-Ach!—I say, you will be often observing & comparing these things which I have enumerated, & many more that now escape me, with the manner of spending Money time & credit at Cohansie.

2. *A Bostonian on South Carolina.* In the same year that Fithian went to Virginia, Josiah Quincy, Jr., of Massachusetts made a trip to the South for his health. Quincy was a twenty-nine year old Harvard graduate, and was already prominent among the critics of British imperial policy. During his trip he remained for some time in South Carolina, and in his journal recorded some of his impressions of the contrast between that province and his native colony.¹⁴

The constitution of South Carolina is in very many respects defective and in an equal number extremely bad.

The inhabitants may well be divided into opulent and lordly planters, poor and spiritless peasants and vile slaves. Having blended with every order of men as much as was possible and convenient, I had considerable opportunity to learn their manners, genius, taste, etc.

The whole body almost of this people seem averse to the claims and assumptions of the British Legislature over the Colonies; but you will seldom hear even in political conversations any warm or animated expressions against the measures of administration. Their fiercer passions seem to be employed upon their slaves and here to expend themselves. A general doubt of the firmness and integrity of the Northern colonies is prevalent: they say the M[assachusetts] Bay can talk, vote and resolve—but their doings are not correspondent: sentiments and expressions of this kind are common and fashionable; they arise from various causes: I imagine from envy and jealousy in some, and from artifice in others: the very remarkable difference in their manners and religious tenets and notions contribute to the same effect.

It may well be questioned whether *in reality* there is any third branch in the constitution of this government. 'Tis true they have a house of Assembly: but who do they represent? The laborer, the mechanic, the tradesman, the farmer, husbandman or yeoman? No. The representatives are almost if not wholly rich planters. The Planting interest is therefore represented, but I conceive nothing else (*as it ought to be*). . . .

State, magnificence and ostentation, the natural attendants of riches, are conspicuous among this people: the number and subjection of their slaves tend this way. Cards, dice, the bottle and horses engross prodigious portions of time and attention: the gentlemen (planters and merchants) are mostly men of the turf and gamblers. Political inquiries and philosophic disquisitions are too laborious for them: they have no great passion for to shine and blaze in the forum or a senate.

The yeomanry and husbandmen make a very different figure from those of New England: the

middling order in the Capital are odious characters.

The state of religion here is repugnant not only to the ordinances and institutions of Jesus Christ, but to every law of sound policy.

The Sabbath is a day of visiting and mirth with the rich, and of licence, pastime and frolic for the negroes. The blacks I saw in great numbers playing pawpaw, huzzle-cap, pitch penny, and quarrelling round the doors of the Churches in service-time; and as to their priests—Voltaire says “always speak well of the prior.” The slaves who don’t frolic on the Sabbath, do all kinds of work for themselves on hire.

The ladies of Charlestown want much of the fire and vivacity of the North, or I want taste and discernment. . . .

The staple commodities are rice, indigo, hemp, tobacco, peas, skins and naval stores: the two first are the capital. The general topics of conversation, when cards, the bottle and occurrences of the day don’t intervene, are of negroes, and the price of indigo and rice: I was surprised to find this so general. . . .

The brutality used towards the slaves has a very bad tendency with reference to the manners of the people, but a much worse with regard to the youth. They will plead in their excuse “this severity is necessary.” But whence did or does this necessity arise? From the necessity of having vast multitudes sunk in barbarism, ignorance and the basest and most servile employ! By reason of this slavery, the children are early impressed with infamous and destructive ideas, and become extremely vitiated in their manners, they contract a negroish kind of accent, pronunciation and dialect, as well as ridiculous kind of behaviour: even many of the grown people, and especially the women, are vastly infected with the same disorder. Parents instead of talking to their very young children in the unmeaning way with us, converse to them as though they were speak[ing] to a new imported African.

3. *A Carolinian on New England.* If men under the religious influence of Puritanism disapproved, as did Fithian and Quincy, of much that they found in Virginia and Carolina it is not to be supposed that men of other colonies altogether admired what they saw in New England. Lewis Morris of New York, making his will in 1760 had especially provided that his son, Gouverneur, should never be sent to Connecticut for an education “. . . lest he should imbibe in his youth that lowe craft and cunning so incident to the People of that Colony . . . though many of them under the sanctified garb of Religion have endeavored to impose themselves

on the world for honest men.” This quality of distrust of New England also cropped out occasionally in the Continental Congress. It shows, for instance, in a letter, June 29, 1776, from one of the delegates, Edward Rutledge of South Carolina, to John Jay of New York. Rutledge urges Jay to resist setting up any central authority that can control the individual colonies, because he fears that New England will dominate.¹⁵

If the Plan now proposed should be adopted nothing less than Ruin to some Colonies will be the Consequence of it. The Idea of destroying all Provincial Distinctions and making every thing of the most minute kind bend to what they call the good of the whole, is in other Terms to say that these Colonies must be subject to the Government of the Eastern Provinces. The Force of their Arms I hold exceeding Cheap, but I confess I dread their overruling Influence in Council. I dread their low Cunning, and those levelling Principles which Men without Character and without Fortune in general possess, which are so captivating to the lower class of Mankind, and which will occasion such a fluctuation of Property as to introduce the greatest disorder. I am resolved to vest the Congress with no more Power than that is absolutely necessary, and to use a familiar Expression, to keep the Staff in our own Hands; for I am confident if surrendered into the Hands of others a most pernicious use will be made of it.

4. *A Virginian Agrees.* Carter Braxton, a Virginia delegate to the Continental Congress, also viewed New England with suspicion. In the spring of 1776 he still hoped to force concessions from England and he at that time opposed plans for a Declaration of Independence. But, as he confided to Landon Carter in a letter on April 14, he feared that New England would force the issue.¹⁶

For however strange it may appear I am satisfied that the eastern Colonies do not mean to have a Reconciliation and in this I am justified by publick and private Reasons. To illustrate my Opinion I will beg leave to mention them. Two of the New England Colonies enjoy a Government purely democratical the Nature and Principle of which both civil and religious are so totally incompatible with Monarchy, that they have ever lived in a restless state under it. The other two tho’ not so popular in their frame bordered so near upon it that Monarchical Influence hung very heavy on them. The best opportunity in the World being now offered them to throw off all subjection and embrace their darling Democracy they are determined to accept it. These are aided by those of a private Nature, but not less cogent. The

Colonies of Massachusetts, and Connecticut who rule the other two, have Claims on the Province of Pennsylvania in the whole for near one third of the Land within their Provincial Bounds and indeed the claim extended to its full extent comes within four miles of this City. This dispute was carried to the King and Council, and with them it now lies. The Eastern Colonies unwilling they should now be the Arbiter have asserted their Claims by force, and have at this time eight hundred men in arms upon the upper part of this Land called Wyoming, where they are peaceable at present only through the Influence of the Congress. Then naturally, there arises a heart burning and jealousy between these people and they must have two very different Objects in View. The Province of New York is not without her Fears and apprehensions from the Temper of her Neighbors, their great swarms and small Territory. Even Virginia is not free from Claim on Pennsylvania nor Maryland from those on Virginia. Some of the Delegates from our Colony carry their Ideas of right to lands so far to the Eastward that the middle Colonies dread their being swallowed up between the Claims of them and those from the East. And yet without any Adjustment of those disputes and a variety of other matters, some are for Lugging us into Independence. . . .

5. *Quakers and Congregationalists.* John Adams of Massachusetts kept a complete file of his papers as a delegate to the first Continental Congress, and these show that the New Englanders felt somewhat aware of the hostility to them in other colonies. His friend Joseph Hawley of Massachusetts wrote to him before the Congress met, warning him that "There is an opinion which does in some degree obtain in the other Colonies that the Massachusetts gentlemen and especially of the town of Boston, do affect to dictate and take the lead in Continental measures; that we are apt, from an inward vanity and self-conceit, to assume big and haughty airs." Later, the developments at Philadelphia justified Hawley's warning, for Adams himself, some years afterward, made a written record of an incident that had befallen him while he was a delegate.¹⁷

There is an anecdote which ought not to be omitted, because it had consequences of some moment at the time, which have continued to operate for many years, and, indeed, are not yet worn out, though the cause is forgotten, or rather was never generally known. Governor Hopkins and Governor Ward, of Rhode Island, came to our lodgings and said to us, that President Manning, of Rhode Island College, and Mr. Backus, of Massachusetts, were in town, and had conversed with some gen-

tlemen in Philadelphia who wished to communicate to us a little business, and wished we would meet them at six in the evening at Carpenters' Hall. Whether they explained their affairs more particularly to any of my colleagues, I know not; but I had no idea of the design. We all went at the hour, and to my great surprise found the hall almost full of people, and a great number of Quakers seated at the long table with their broad-brimmed beavers on their heads. We were invited to seats among them, and informed that they had received complaints, from some Anabaptists and some Friends in Massachusetts, against certain laws of that Province, restrictive of the liberty of conscience, and some instances were mentioned, in the General Court, and in the courts of justice, in which Friends and Baptists had been grievously oppressed. I know not how my colleagues felt, but I own I was greatly surprised and somewhat indignant, being, like my friend Chase, of a temper naturally quick and warm, at seeing our State and her delegates thus summoned before a self-created tribunal, which was neither legal nor constitutional.

Israel Pemberton, a Quaker of large property and more intrigue, began to speak, and said that Congress were here endeavoring to form a union of the Colonies; but there were difficulties in the way, and none of more importance than liberty of conscience. The laws of New England, and particularly of Massachusetts, were inconsistent with it, for they not only compelled men to pay to the building of churches and support of ministers, but to go to some known religious assembly on first days, &c.; and that he and his friends were desirous of engaging us to assure them that our State would repeal all those laws, and place things as they were in Pennsylvania.

A suspicion instantly arose in my mind, which I have ever believed to have been well founded, that this artful Jesuit, for I had been before apprized of his character, was endeavoring to avail himself of this opportunity to break up the Congress, or at least to withdraw the Quakers and the governing part of Pennsylvania from us; for, at that time, by means of a most unequal representation, the Quakers had a majority in their House of Assembly, and, by consequence, the whole power of the State in their hands. I arose, and spoke in answer to him. The substance of what I said, was, that we had no authority to bind our constituents to any such proposals; that the laws of Massachusetts were the most mild and equitable establishment of religion that was known in the world; if indeed they could be called an establishment; that it would be in vain for us to enter into any conferences on such a subject, for we knew beforehand our constituents would disavow all we could do or say for the satisfaction

of those who invited us to this meeting. That the people of Massachusetts were as religious and conscientious as the people of Pennsylvania; that their consciences dictated to them that it was their duty to support those laws, and therefore the very liberty of conscience, which Mr. Pemberton invoked, would demand indulgence for the tender consciences of the people of Massachusetts, and allow them to preserve their laws; that it might be depended on, this was a point that could not be carried; that I would not deceive them by insinuating the faintest hope, for I knew they might as well turn the heavenly bodies out of their annual and diurnal courses, as the people of Massachusetts at the present day from their meeting-house and Sunday laws. Pemberton made no reply but this: "Oh! sir, pray don't urge liberty of conscience in favor of such laws!" If I had known the particular complaints which were to be alleged, and if Pemberton had not broken irregularly into the midst of things, it might have been better, perhaps, to have postponed this declaration. However, the gentlemen proceeded, and stated the particular cases of oppression, which were alleged, in our general and executive courts. It happened that Mr. Cushing and Mr. Samuel Adams had been present in the General Court when the petitions had been under deliberation, and they explained the whole so clearly that every reasonable man must have been satisfied. Mr. Paine and I had been concerned at the bar in every action in the executive courts which was complained of, and we explained them all to the entire satisfaction of impartial men, and showed that there had been no oppression or injustice in any of them. The Quakers were not generally and heartily in our cause; they were jealous of independence; they were then suspicious, and soon afterwards became assured, that the Massachusetts delegates, and especially John Adams, were advocates for that obnoxious measure, and they conceived prejudices which were soon increased and artfully inflamed, and are not yet worn out.

6. *Dissension in the Army.* Not only in Congress, but also in the Continental Army, inter-colonial jealousies and dissensions tended to spring up. Washington was unalterably opposed to any such tendencies and he combated them constantly. He reported to the President of the Congress, December 20, 1776: "I have laboured ever since I have been in the Service, to discourage all kinds of local attachments and distinctions of Country, denominating the whole by the greater name of American, but I found it impossible to overcome prejudices." The difficulties which Washington confronted, and the manner in which he attempted to deal with them are suggested by

the General Orders which he issued to the army on August 1, 1776, less than a month after independence.¹⁸

GENERAL ORDERS

Head Quarters, New York, August 1, 1776.
Parole Paris. Countersign Reading.

It is with great concern, the General understands, that Jealousies &c. are arisen among the troops from the different Provinces, of reflections frequently thrown out, which can only tend to irritate each other, and injure the noble cause in which we are engaged, and which we ought to support with one hand and one heart. The General most earnestly entreats the officers, and soldiers, to consider the consequences; that they can no way assist our cruel enemies more effectually, than making division among ourselves; That the Honor and Success of the army, and the safety of our bleeding Country, depends upon harmony and good agreement with each other; That the Provinces are all United to oppose the common enemy, and all distinctions sunk in the name of an American; to make this honorable, and preserve the Liberty of our Country, ought to be our only emulation, and he will be the best Soldier, and the best Patriot, who contributes most to this glorious work, whatever his Station, or from whatever part of the Continent, he may come: Let all distinctions of Nations, Countries, and Provinces, therefore be lost in the generous contest, who shall behave with the most Courage against the enemy, and the most kindness and good humour to each other—If there are any officers, or soldiers, so lost to virtue and a love of their Country as to continue in such practices after this order; The General assures them, and is directed by Congress to declare, to the whole Army, that such persons shall be severely punished and dismissed the service with disgrace.

7. *A British View.* Turning away from American sources for a moment, it is interesting to see what an English observer predicted for the cause of American Union. In 1781, Josiah Tucker, an English clergyman who wrote widely on political and economic questions, gave his readers a carefully reasoned forecast as to the future unity of America.¹⁹

As to the future Grandeur of America, and its being a rising Empire, under *one Head*, whether Republican, or Monarchical, it is one of the idlest, and most visionary Notions, that ever was conceived even by Writers of Romance. For there is nothing in the Genius of the People, the Situation of their Country, or the Nature of their different Climates, which tends to Countenance such a Supposition. On the contrary, every Prognostic that

can be formed from a Contemplation of their mutual Antipathies, and clashing Interests, their Difference of Governments, Habitues, and Manners,—plainly indicates, that the *Americans* will have no *Center of Union* among them, and no *Common Interest* to pursue, when the Power and Government of *England* are finally removed. Moreover, when the Intersections and Divisions of their Country by great Bays of the Sea, and by

vast Rivers, Lakes, and Ridges of Mountains;—and above all, when those immense inland Regions, beyond the Back Settlements, which are still unexplored, are taken into the Account, they form the highest Probability that the *Americans* never can be united into one compact Empire, under any Species of Government whatever. Their Fate seems to be—A DISUNITED PEOPLE, till the End of Time.

B.

THE DESTINY OF AMERICA

Although the development of inter-colonial harmony met with many obstacles, and loyalty to the separate colony or state remained primary in the minds of great numbers of people, it had long been true that many of the colonists thought, at least occasionally, in the broader terms of America as a whole. Only a decade after the Plymouth landing, one immigrant had already become Yankee enough to declare that “a sup of New England air is better than a whole flagon of old English ale.” Later, Jonathan Edwards expressed the belief that Providence had marked America to be “the glorious renovator of the world.”

As America grew in population, wealth, and social progress, these visions of an American destiny began to take form and to find a clear expression. Some of these expressions form a striking contrast to the attitudes shown in the preceding group of selections.

1. *National Poetry: Trumbull.* Five years before the Revolution, John Trumbull, aged twenty, was at Yale, taking his Master of Arts degree. During that year he wrote some notable verses, “Prospect of the Future Glory of America.” The tone of this poem may be explained partly by the fact that it was written soon after the Boston Massacre, but it is nevertheless remarkable that such verses could have been written at a time when no one had any idea either of fighting the Revolution or of separating from Britain.²⁰

See, this blest land in orient morn appears,
Waked from the slumber of six thousand years,
While clouds of darkness veil'd each cheering ray;
To savage beasts and savage men, a prey.
Fair Freedom now her ensigns bright displays,
And peace and plenty bless the golden days.
In radiant state th' imperial realm shall rise,
Her splendor circling to the boundless skies;
Of every Fair she boasts the assembled charms,
The Queen of empires and the nurse of arms.

See her bold heroes mark their glorious way,
Arm'd for the fight and blazing on the day!
Blood stains their steps, and o'er th' ensanguined plain,
Mid warring thousands and mid thousands slain,
Their eager swords unsated carnage blend,
And ghastly deaths their raging course attend.
Her dreaded power the subject world shall see,
And laurel'd conquest wait her high decree.

And see her navies, rushing to the main,
Catch the swift gales and sweep the wat'ry plain:
Or led by commerce, at the merchant's door
Unlade the treasures of the Asian shore;
Or arm'd with thunder, on the guilty foe
Rush big with death and aim th' unerring blow;
Bid every realm, that hears the trump of fame,
Quake at the distant terror of her name.

For pleasing Arts behold her matchless charms,
The first in letters, as the first in arms.
See bolder genius quit the narrow shore,
And realms of science, yet untraced, explore,
Hiding in brightness of superior day,
The fainting gleam of Europe's setting ray.

2. *National Poetry: Dwight.* Timothy Dwight, a grandson of Jonathan Edwards, a friend of John Trumbull, and a graduate of Yale in the class of 1769 at the age of 17, was serving as a tutor at Yale when the Revolution broke out. He vigorously exhorted the students to accept nationalistic views, and it appears that he did much to make Yale an early center of nationalist feeling. His vision of the destiny of America is shown in the poem, “Columbia,” which he wrote probably in 1777, while serving as a chaplain in the Revolutionary army.²¹

Columbia, Columbia, to glory arise,
The queen of the world, and child of the skies!
Thy genius commands thee; with rapture behold,
While ages on ages thy splendors unfold.

Thy reign is the last, and the noblest of time,
 Most fruitful thy soil, most inviting thy clime;
 Let the crimes of the east ne'er encrimson thy
 name,
 Be freedom, and science, and virtue, thy fame.

To conquest, and slaughter, let Europe aspire;
 Whelm nations in blood, and wrap cities in fire;
 Thy heroes the rights of mankind shall defend,
 And triumph pursue them, and glory attend.
 A world is thy realm: for a world be thy laws,
 Enlarg'd as thine empire, and just as thy cause;
 On Freedom's broad basis, that empire shall rise,
 Extend with the main, and dissolve with the skies.

Fair Science her gates to thy sons shall unbar,
 And the east see thy morn hide the beams of her
 star.

New bards, and new sages, unrival'd shall soar
 To fame, unextinguish'd, when time is no more;
 To thee, the last refuge of virtue design'd,
 Shall fly from all nations the best of mankind;
 Here, grateful to Heaven, with transport shall
 bring
 Their incense, more fragrant than odours of
 spring.

Nor less shall thy fair ones to glory ascend,
 And Genius and Beauty in harmony blend;
 The graces of form shall awake pure desire,
 And the charms of the soul ever cherish the fire;
 Their sweetness unmingled, their manners refin'd
 And virtue's bright image, instamp'd on the mind,
 With peace, and soft rapture, shall teach life to
 glow,
 And light up a smile in the aspect of woe.

Thy fleets to all regions thy pow'r shall display,
 The nations admire, and the ocean obey;
 Each shore to thy glory its tribute unfold,
 And the east and the south yield their spices and
 gold, . . .

3. *The American Language*. A third Yale graduate who reflected the nationalist stirrings of the Revolutionary period was Noah Webster. He was born at West Hartford, Connecticut in 1758, entered Yale in '74, left for a period of military service in the Revolution, but returned and received his degree in '78. He was admitted to the bar, but did not practice; instead he taught school. His teaching convinced him of the importance of a uniform American speech as a bond of union and he wrote on the importance of a national language. His *Dissertations on the English Language* (1789) provided an outstanding statement of this viewpoint. Later Webster was

to compile his dictionary, which contributed immeasurably to the goal of national uniformity in the use of words.²²

There are . . . important reasons, why the language of this country should be reduced to such fixed principles, as may give its pronunciation and construction all the certainty and uniformity which any living tongue is capable of receiving.

The United States were settled by emigrants from different parts of Europe. But their descendants mostly speak the same tongue; and the intercourse among the learned of the different States, which the revolution has begun and an American Court will perpetuate, must gradually destroy the differences of dialect which our ancestors brought from their native countries. This approximation of dialects will be certain; but without the operation of other causes than an intercourse at Court, it will be slow and partial. The body of the people, governed by habit, will still retain their respective peculiarities of speaking; and for want of schools and proper books, fall into many inaccuracies, which, incorporating with the language of the state where they live, may imperceptibly corrupt the national language. Nothing but the establishment of schools and some uniformity in the use of books, can annihilate differences in speaking and preserve the purity of the American tongue. A sameness of pronunciation is of considerable consequence in a political view; for provincial accents are disagreeable to strangers and sometimes have an unhappy effect upon the social affections. All men have local attachments, which lead them to believe their own practice to be the least exceptionable. Pride and prejudice incline men to treat the practice of their neighbors with some degree of contempt. Thus small differences in pronunciation at first excite ridicule—a habit of laughing at the singularities of strangers is followed by disrespect—and without respect friendship is a name, and social intercourse a mere ceremony.

These remarks hold equally true, with respect to individuals, to small societies and to large communities. Small causes, such as a nick-name, or a vulgar tone in speaking, have actually created a dissocial spirit between the inhabitants of the different states, which is often discoverable in private business and public deliberations. Our political harmony is therefore concerned in a uniformity of language.

As an independent nation, our honor requires us to have a system of our own, in language as well as government. Great Britain, whose children we are, and whose language we speak, should no longer be *our* standard; for the taste of her writers is already corrupted, and her language on the decline. But if it were not so, she is at too great a

distance to be our model, and to instruct us in the principles of our own tongue.

It must be considered further, that the English is the common root or stock from which our national language will be derived. All others will gradually waste away—and within a century and a half, North America will be peopled with a hundred millions of men, *all speaking the same language*. Place this idea in comparison with the present and possible future bounds of the language in Europe—consider the Eastern [that is, European] Continent as inhabited by nations, whose knowledge and intercourse are embarrassed by differences of language; then anticipate the period when the people of one quarter of the world, will be able to associate and converse together like children of the same family. Compare this prospect, which is not visionary, with the state of the English language in Europe, almost confined to an Island and to a few millions of people; then let reason and reputation decide, how far America should be dependent on a transatlantic nation, for her standard and improvements in language.

Let me add, that whatever predilection the Americans may have for their native European tongues, and particularly the British descendants for the English, yet several circumstances render a future separation of the American tongue from the English, necessary and unavoidable. The vicinity of the European nations, with the uninterrupted communication in peace, and the changes of domination in war, are gradually assimilating their respective languages. The English with others is suffering continual alterations. America, placed at a distance from those nations, will feel, in a much less degree, the influence of the assimilating causes: at the same time, numerous local causes, such as a new country, new associations of people, new combinations of ideas in arts and science, and some intercourse with tribes wholly unknown in Europe, will introduce new words into the American tongue. These causes will produce, in a course of time, a language in North America, as different from the future language of England, as the modern Dutch, Danish and Swedish are from the German, or from one another. . . .

A national language is a band of national union. Every engine should be employed to render the people of this country *national*; to call their attachments home to their own country; and to inspire them with the pride of national character. However they may boast of Independence, and the freedom of their government, yet their *opinions* are not sufficiently independent; an astonishing respect for the arts and literature of their parent country, and a blind imitation of its manners, are still prevalent among the Americans. . . .

Let us then seize the present moment, and establish a *national language*, as well as a national

government. Let us remember that there is a certain respect due to the opinions of other nations. As an independent people, our reputation abroad demands that, in all things, we should be federal; be *national*; for if we do not respect *ourselves*, we may be assured that *other nations* will not respect us. In short, let it be impressed upon the mind of every American, that to neglect the means of commanding respect abroad, is treason against the character and dignity of a brave independent people.

4. *A New Loyalty.* The creation of a nation of Americans has involved not only the willingness of people to place the general loyalty to America above the local loyalty to the state, but also the willingness of men and women descended from Old World stock (as virtually all Americans are) to place the new loyalty to their adopted home above the old loyalty to their ancestral home. No one has explained this willingness better than Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur (1735–1813). Crèvecoeur, a native of France, moved to Canada while it was still a French colony, and after its conquest he became a farmer in Orange County, New York. During his residence in New York, he wrote his *Letters from An American Farmer*. These contained one of the earliest of all attempts to define a distinctive American type, and to show why America so readily enlisted the loyalties of immigrants.²³

In this great American asylum, the poor of Europe have by some means met together, and in consequence of various causes; to what purpose should they ask one another what countrymen they are? Alas, two thirds of them had no country. Can a wretch who wanders about, who works and starves, whose life is a continual scene of sore affliction or pinching penury; can that man call England or any other kingdom his country? A country that had no bread for him, whose fields procured him no harvest, who met with nothing but the frowns of the rich, the severity of the laws, with jails and punishments; who owned not a single foot of the extensive surface of this planet? No! urged by a variety of motives, here they came. Every thing has tended to regenerate them; new laws, a new mode of living, a new social system; here they are become men: in Europe they were as so many useless plants, wanting vegetative mold, and refreshing showers; they withered, and were mowed down by want, hunger, and war; but now by the power of transplantation, like all other plants they have taken root and flourished! Formerly they were not numbered in any civil lists of their country, except in those of the poor; here they rank as citizens. By what invisible power has this surprising metamorphosis been performed?

By that of the laws and that of their industry. The laws, the indulgent laws, protect them as they arrive, stamping on them the symbol of adoption; they receive ample rewards for their labours; these accumulated rewards procure them lands; those lands confer on them the title of freemen, and to that title every benefit is affixed which men can possibly require. This is the great operation daily performed by our laws. . . .

What attachment can a poor European emigrant have for a country where he had nothing? The knowledge of the language, the love of a few kindred as poor as himself, were the only cords that tied him: his country is now that which gives him land, bread, protection, and consequence: *Ubi panis ibi patria*, is the motto of all emigrants. What then is the American, this new man? He is either an European, or the descendant of an European, hence that strange mixture of blood, which you will find in no other country. I could point out to you a family whose grandfather was an Englishman, whose wife was Dutch, whose son married a French woman, and whose present four sons have now four wives of different nations. *He* is an American, who, leaving behind him all his ancient prejudices and manners, receives new ones from the new mode of life he has embraced, the new government he obeys, and the new rank he holds. He becomes an American by being received in the broad lap of our great *Alma Mater*. Here individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men, whose labours and posterity will one day cause great changes in the world. Americans are the western pilgrims, who are carrying along with them that great mass of arts, sciences, vigour, and industry which began long since in the east; they will finish the great circle. The Americans were once scattered all over Europe; here they are incorporated into one of the finest systems of population which has ever appeared, and which will hereafter become distinct by the power of the different climates they inhabit. The American ought therefore to love this country much better than that wherein either he or his forefathers were born. Here the rewards of his industry follow with equal steps the progress of his labour; his labour is founded on the basis of nature, *self-interest*; can it want a stronger allurement? Wives and children, who before in vain demanded of him a morsel of bread, now, fat and frolicsome, gladly help their father to clear those fields whence exuberant crops are to arise to feed and to clothe them all; without any part being claimed, either by a despotic prince, a rich abbot, or a mighty lord. Here religion demands but little of him; a small voluntary salary to the minister, and gratitude to God; can he refuse these? The American is a new man, who acts upon new principles; he must therefore entertain new ideas, and form new

opinions. From involuntary idleness, servile dependence, penury, and useless labour, he has passed to toils of a very different nature, rewarded by ample subsistence.—This is an American.

5. *War Advances Unity*. Washington's General Orders of August 1, 1776, quoted on page 23 above, illustrate the extent to which the Revolutionary Army suffered from dissension among troops from different colonies or states. Despite these difficulties, however, the existence of a Continental army itself tended to create more tangible links among various parts of America. One of the first observers to comment on this was a South Carolina physician, David Ramsay, who served in the Continental Congress, and in 1789 published a *History of the American Revolution*.²⁴

The Americans knew but little of one another, previous to the revolution. Trade and business had brought the inhabitants of their seaports acquainted with each other, but the bulk of the people in the interior country were unacquainted with their fellow citizens. A continental army, and Congress, composed of men from all the States, by freely mixing together, were assimilated into one mass. Individuals of both, mingling with the citizens, disseminated principles of union among them. Local prejudices abated. By frequent collision asperities were worn off, and a foundation was laid for the establishment of a nation, out of discordant materials. Intermarriages between men and women of different States were much more common than before the war, and became an additional cement to the union. Unreasonable jealousies had existed between the inhabitants of the eastern and of the southern States; but on becoming better acquainted with each other, these in a great measure subsided. A wiser policy prevailed. Men of liberal minds led the way in discouraging local distinctions, and the great body of the people, as soon as reason got the better of prejudice, found that their best interests would be most effectually promoted by such practices and sentiments as were favourable to union. Religious bigotry had broken in upon the peace of various sects, before the American war. This was kept up by partial establishments, and by a dread that the church of England, through the power of the mother country, would be made to triumph over all other denominations. These apprehensions were done away by the revolution. The different sects, having nothing to fear from each other, dismissed all religious controversy. A proposal for introducing bishops into America before the war, had kindled a flame among the dissenters; but the revolution was no sooner accomplished, than a scheme for that purpose was perfected, with the consent and approbation of all those sects who had

previously opposed it. Pulpits which had formerly been shut to worthy men, because their heads had not been consecrated by the imposition of the hands of a bishop or of a presbytery, have since the establishment of independence, been reciprocally opened to each other, whensoever the public convenience required it. The world will soon see the result of an experiment in politics, and be able to determine whether the happiness of society is increased by religious establishments, or diminished by the want of them.

6. *Washington's Farewell.* Among all the early spokesmen of nationalism, George Washington occupies a unique position because he not only visualized the goal of union, but also did more than anyone else to attain it. Washington never missed a chance to condemn local jealousies or to exalt the ideal of union. His letters, orders, and papers abound in statements on this point. When he took leave of his Army at Newburgh in 1783, the principal theme of his message upon giving up his command, was the vital importance of maintaining an effective union. When he later became President, under the new Constitution, he continued to place great emphasis on this point, and when he prepared to retire from the Presidency in 1796, his last public statement—the famous Farewell Address—once again stressed the crucial value of union. Although there is a stiff formality about his language, Washington's analysis is genuinely brilliant. At a time when the concept of an American nation was in its infancy, he stated the case for such a nation as well perhaps as it could ever be stated.²⁵

... The Unity of Government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main Pillar in the Edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very Liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee, that from different causes and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national Union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual and immoveable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the Palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with

jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our Country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of AMERICAN, which belongs to you, in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of Patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same Religion, Manners, Habits and political Principles. You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together. The independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint councils, and joint efforts; of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your Interest. Here every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the Union of the whole.

The *North*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *South*, protected by the equal Laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of Maratime and commercial enterprise and precious materials of manufacturing industry. The *South* in the same Intercourse, benefitting by the Agency of the *North*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *North*, it finds its particular navigation enervated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the National navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a Maratime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *East*, in a like intercourse with the *West*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications, by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *West* derives from the *East* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort, and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions to the weight, influence, and the future Maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of Interest as *one Nation*. Any other tenure by which the *West* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength or from an apostate and unnatural con-

nection with any foreign Power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular Interest in Union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their Peace by foreign Nations; and, what is of inestimable value! they must derive from Union an exemption from those broils and Wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighbouring countries, not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalships alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments and intrigues would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown Military establishments, which under any form of Government, are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to Republican Liberty: In this sense it is, that your Union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind, and exhibit the continuance of the UNION as a pri-

mary object of Patriotic desire. Is there a doubt, whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? Let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective Sub divisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. 'Tis well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to Union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason, to distrust the patriotism of those, who in any quarter may endeavor to weaken its bands.

In contemplating the causes wch. may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *Geographical* discriminations: *Northern* and *Southern*; *Atlantic* and *Western*; whence designing men may endeavour to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of Party to acquire influence, within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other Districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations. . . .

C.

THE CONCEPT OF "MY COUNTRY"

In the creed of nationalism, the term "country" is loaded with emotional connotations. Washington was apotheosized as the "Father of his Country"; the song *America* begins "my country"; when Edward Everett Hale wrote his story of a man who had made himself a homeless wanderer on the face of the earth, he entitled it "The Man without a Country"; Shakespeare had declared,

"One drop of blood drawn from thy country's bosom,
Should grieve thee more than streams of foreign gore."

When an American speaks of "my country" today, no one doubts that he means the United States. It would, therefore, be tempting to project this meaning into the past, and to assume that when the men of the Revolution used the term they also were referring to the Union. But one of the most treacherous pitfalls in the use of historical evidence lies in the fact that words are used in various senses at various times. The only way to tell what the Revolutionary patriots conceived to be their country, whether they employed the word consistently or ambiguously, and what emotional value it may have had for them, is to examine how they used it. A prominent Federalist, Fisher Ames, declared in 1792, that "Instead of feeling as a nation, a state is our country"; but Ames was writing in a mood of momentary pessimism in which he despaired of securing adequate support for the central government. The following brief selections, in which the term is used less consciously, will throw some light on this concept of country.

1. *From a letter of John Adams to his wife, September 18, 1774*, expressing the hope that the Massachusetts delegation would pursue a creditable course in the Congress.²⁶

We have a delicate course to steer between too much activity and too much insensibility in our critical, interested situation. I flatter myself, however, that we shall conduct our embassy in such a

manner as to merit the approbation of our country.

2. *From a proclamation of Thanksgiving, ordered by the colony of Massachusetts, November 4, 1775.*²⁷

Although, in consequence of the unnatural, cruel, and barbarous measures adopted and pursued by the *British* Administration, great and distressing calamities are brought upon our oppressed Country, and on this Colony in particular, we feel the dreadful effects of civil war, by which *America* is stained with the blood of her valiant sons . . . yet we have the greatest reason to adore and praise the Supreme Disposer of Events, who deals infinitely better with us than we deserve. . . . Therefore, we have thought fit . . . to appoint *Thursday, the 23d day of November* . . . to be observed as a day of publick Thanksgiving throughout this Colony.

3. *From a proclamation of Pennsylvania and Virginia Commissioners* to the people of these two states, in connection with the settlement of a boundary dispute, July 25, 1775. Signed by Richard Henry Lee, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, Benjamin Franklin, James Wilson, and others.²⁸

Friends and Countrymen: All animosities which have heretofore subsisted among you as inhabitants of distinct colonies may now give place to generous and concurring efforts for the preservation of everything that can make our common country dear to us.

4. *From a letter of Daniel Roberdeau*, Pennsylvania delegate to the Second Continental Congress, to the President of Pennsylvania, January 26, 1778. Roberdeau expresses concern that certain Pennsylvania foodstuffs have not reached the Continental Army, to which they were assigned.²⁹

I could weep over my suffering Country, cramped at this season for vigorous exertion, by the want of provisions, with which our Country abounds.

5. *From a letter of Samuel Adams*, member of the Continental Congress, January 6, 1779. Adams is comparing two of the American Commissioners to France, Silas Deane of Connecticut and Arthur Lee of the Virginia family of Lees.³⁰

[Deane] was in the opinion of some of his own Countrymen as well as of others, of a doubtful political Character. Mr. Lee continued to transmit to our Friends in France as well as to Congress, before he left England, the most accurate State-[ment] of things there. Such was the opinion en-

tertained by Congress of his Abilities, his Integrity, and his Zeal and Attachment to his Country, which indeed had been long experienced, that he was employed as a most useful and necessary Man.

6. *From the diary of Sergeant John Smith of Bristol, Rhode Island.* Sergeant Smith, a plain, straightforward soldier marched from Rhode Island in September, 1776, to join Washington's army outside New York. In the winter that followed, Washington made his famous retreat across New Jersey to the Delaware, which he re-crossed at Christmas to win the Battle of Trenton. On the last day of the year, the term of enlistment of Smith's brigade expired, and the troops were free to go home unless they should re-enlist. Their general, however, persuaded them to continue in the service. Smith describes the incident as follows.³¹

Munday the 30th in the Afternoon our Brigade was sent for into the feild where we Paraded Befor the General who was present with all the feild Officers & after meaking many fair promises to them he Begged them to tarey one month Longer in the Scervice & Almost Every man Consented to stay Longer who Received 10 Doler Bounty as soon as Signd their names then the Genll with the soldiers gave three Huzzas & was with Claping of hands for Joy amongst the Specttators & as soon as that was over the Genell ordred us to heave a gill of Rum pr man & set out to trenton to acquaint Genll Washinton with his Good success as he termd it to Meak his heart Glad Once more we was Dismissd to Goe to our Quarters with great Applause the inhabitants & others saying we had Done honour to our Country viz New England

7. *Nathan Hale.* For the Revolutionary period, the most important instance of the use of the term country, was that attributed to Nathan Hale at the time of his execution by the British. Hale was born in Coventry, Connecticut, and graduated from Yale in 1773, at the age of 18. He joined the Revolutionary Army in 1775 as a lieutenant, was promoted to a captaincy a year later. During September of '76 Washington called on the commander of Hale's regiment to secure volunteers for a very dangerous intelligence mission. Hale alone answered the call for volunteers. He was sent behind the enemy's lines, secured the desired information, and was on his way back to the American army when he was caught by the British and taken before General Sir William Howe. Hale boldly admitted his connection with the American army, and

was accordingly convicted as a spy. He was put to death by hanging on the morning of September 22, 1776. He became perhaps the first American hero of the Revolution, and certainly the first who did not hold high military rank.

Our knowledge of the circumstances of Hale's death is based entirely upon two sources. The first of these was a record made by a British officer, Lieutenant Frederick Mackenzie, in his diary, on the day of the execution. It is not stated whether he was or was not an eye-witness of the event. The other account appeared in the memoirs of William Hull, published in 1848. Hull, who had been a college friend of Hale, did not witness the execution, but secured his information under a flag of truce from a British eye-witness, Captain John Montresor. His memoirs were written at an undetermined time, for his children and grandchildren, and were prepared for publication by his daughter, who included material of her own, but the account of Hale's death is given as a direct quote from Hull's manuscript. Although these accounts may fail to agree in their version of Hale's last words, they are at one in depicting him as a brave man who made the greatest possible sacrifice. The questions whether he actually used the expression, "my country," and precisely what connotations it had if he did use it, are interesting in connection with American nationalism; but so far as Hale personally is concerned, the important thing is the bravery and unselfishness of his action, and not his choice of words at the time of execution.³²

[*Mackenzie's account.*] A person named Nathaniel Hales, a Lieutenant in the Rebel Army, and a native of Connecticut, was apprehended as a Spy, last night upon Long Island; and having this day made a full and free confession to the Commander in Chief of his being employed by Mr. Washington in that capacity, he was hanged at 11 o'clock in front of the Park of Artillery. He

was about 24 years of age, and had been educated at the College of Newhaven in Connecticut. He behaved with great composure and resolution, saying he thought it the duty of every good Officer, to obey any orders given him by his Commander in Chief; and desired the Spectators to be at all times prepared to meet death in whatever shape it might appear.

[*Hull's account.*] He [Montresor] said that Captain Hale had passed through their army, both of Long Island and York Island. That he had procured sketches of the fortifications, and made memoranda of their number and different positions. When apprehended, he was taken before Sir William Howe, and these papers, found concealed about his person, betrayed his intentions. He at once declared his name, his rank in the American army, and his object in coming within the British lines.

Sir William Howe, without the form of a trial, gave orders for his execution the following morning. He was placed in the custody of the Provost Marshal, who was a Refugee, and hardened to human suffering and every softening of sentiment of the heart. Captain Hale, alone, without sympathy or support, save that from above, on the near approach of death asked for a clergyman to attend him. It was refused. He then requested a Bible; that too was refused by his inhuman jailer.

"On the morning of his execution," continued the officer, "my station was near the fatal spot, and I requested the Provost Marshal to permit the prisoner to sit in my marquee, while he was making the necessary preparations. Captain Hale entered: he was calm, and bore himself with gentle dignity, in the consciousness of rectitude and high intentions. He asked for writing materials, which I furnished him: he wrote two letters, one to his mother and one to a brother officer." He was shortly after summoned to the gallows. But a few persons were around him, yet his characteristic dying words were remembered. He said, "I only regret, that I have but one life to lose for my country."

II

Nationalism and Union—Establishment of the Republic

THE only chance we have to support a general government is to graft it on the state governments. I want to proceed on this ground, as the safest, and I believe no other plan is practicable. In this way, and in this way only, can we rely on the confidence and support of the people.

OLIVER ELLSWORTH in the Constitutional Convention

CONTENTS

Questions for Study	34
Historical Background	35
Part I: The Articles of Confederation	37
Part II: The Constitution of 1787	48

QUESTIONS FOR STUDY

1. In Part I, Section A, the selections from George Washington and James Wilson indicate a belief that the separate power of the states has grown to a point which endangers the Union. Do the Constitution of South Carolina and the policy of Patrick Henry as governor of Virginia justify this fear?
2. Explain how the problem of the punishment of deserters involved the basic question whether the Congress was an instrument of government for the Union or a mere assembly of diplomatic representatives from sovereign states.
3. When Congress sent the Articles of Confederation to the states, what difficulties did it admit had prevented a more effective union? Did the Congress make any unjustifiable claims as to what the new form of union would accomplish?
4. Are the discussions by Franklin and by Jay of the economic condition of the country utterly inconsistent on questions of fact, or did they differ in the meaning and the importance which they attach to certain facts? Explain.
5. In any adverse criticism of the Articles, one might argue that, tested by results, they were in fact unsatisfactory, or that, tested by sound principles of government, they were obliged to be unsatisfactory. To what extent did Alexander Hamilton rely on each of these contentions in his discussion of "the insufficiency of the present Confederation"?
6. What was the position of the New Jersey Plan on the question of creating a stronger government? In summary, what was the issue on which it was antagonistic to the Virginia Plan?
7. In evaluating the strength of economic motives for supporting or opposing the Constitution, is it valid to say that opponents attempted to create an economic issue, but that advocates did not recognize any such division of interest? Does the evidence suggest that the contest over ratification divided the community into two selfish groups, or only that two selfish groups were present, along with the bulk of citizens who tried to do what was in the public interest?
8. What does Madison mean by the statement that the government is partly federal and partly national? In what sense is it national in the operation of powers, federal in the foundation and the extent of its powers, and mixed in the method of amendment and in the sources from which the powers of government are drawn?
9. In his discussion of the danger of factions, Madison was discussing in an abstract way what the Constitution did to assure that the central government would not follow the radical monetary and debt-repudiation policies pursued in some of the states. How does his analysis apply to the concrete economic issues which arose during the contest over ratification?
10. Why was the governmental system established under the Constitution especially well suited for a country in which nationalistic development was far advanced but still incomplete?

The first problem in this series has shown that nationalism, as a form of group consciousness, grows out of factors of affinity such as common language, common religion, common territory, common customs and traditions. Nationalism, in this sense, extends far beyond the realm of political or governmental action: yet government is vitally connected with nationalism, for it is the goal toward which nationalism always strives. As Kohn declares: "The growth of nationalism is the process of integration of the masses of people into a common political form. Nationalism . . . presupposes the existence, in fact or as our ideal, of a centralized form of government over a large and distinct territory."

If the War of Independence had marked the clear-cut, unchallenged triumph of a vigorous American nationalism, the creation of "a centralized form of government over a large and distinct territory" would easily have resulted. But though the Revolution was in part the first great impulse which unified America as a whole, it was also in part a victory of local home rule over central authority, and as such it fostered a distrust of concentration of power. This distrust would apply to Philadelphia quite as much as it had applied to London. Psychologically, therefore, the loyalties of Americans were ambiguous, and the future of union seemed to depend upon the creation of a governmental structure adjusted to the ambiguity.

Clearly, this was no easy task, and indeed the problem presented two very difficult aspects. One of these aspects, as has just been suggested, involved the reconciling of general loyalty to all America with particularistic loyalty to the separate states. Paradoxically, the Revolution had destroyed old bonds of unity, in so far as the Empire provided them, and had created new ones through the common cause of the Revolution; it had furthered extreme distrust of central authority and at the same time a broader vision of American destiny. In organizing a union the task was to create a governmental structure which would balance centralism and localism politically, to correspond to the emotional balancing of the same forces in the minds of the people.

The other aspect of the problem involved reconciling the principle of collective strength with that of local freedom. Almost universally, men agreed in regarding both strength and freedom as values to be sought, but much of the world's history seemed to show that the two were incompatible—that one could be assured only by the sacrifice of the other. The Roman Empire, for instance, had exemplified the principle of centralized strength, but had compelled diverse peoples to conform to imperial policies. The Greek city states had illustrated the principle of local freedom, but they neglected so much the principle of collective strength that they later fell an easy prey to Macedonia and Rome. The history of America itself seemed to suggest that colonial liberties had flourished in times when the Empire was weak, and that policies which were designed to strengthen the Empire necessarily involved a threat to colonial liberties.

The problem of union, then, was one of balancing centralism with localism, and collective strength with local freedom. Yet when these theoretical goals are stated, it must also be remembered that in practice no political principle is likely to win adoption purely because of its soundness in theory or in logic. Voters are swayed by what they believe will be their own advantage, and therefore the achievement of union depended not only upon the formulation of a frame of government which any political scientist could approve but also upon this government's containing features which would appeal directly to a large enough proportion of citizens.

In the decade of and after the Revolution, American leaders made two major attempts to achieve a working union, first through the Articles of Confederation, adopted in 1781, and second through the present Constitution of the United States, drawn up in 1787. Focussing upon these two attempts, the selections which follow are designed to show more fully the nature of the problem of union, the limits within which it had to be worked out, the contrast between the solutions of 1781 and 1787, the points at issue which divided men into Federalist and anti-Federalist, and, most of all, the theoretical and practical devices by which inconsistent principles were reconciled and conflicting interests adjusted. They are designed to show how the nationalistic goal of "a centralized form of government over a large and distinct territory" could be achieved even before nationalistic sentiment had clearly triumphed over the spirit of localism.

THE PROBLEM

Part I.

THE ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION

There is much dispute as to the time and circumstances of origin of the American union, but one point upon which everyone can agree is that the idea of union existed before the Revolution and before the idea of independence. As early as 1643 the colonies of Massachusetts Bay, Plymouth, Connecticut, and New Haven had formed the New England Confederation for the purpose, among others, of taking concerted action against the Indians. This organization lasted until 1684. It was confined to the New England area and did not involve any concept of general union. In 1698, however, William Penn brought forward a proposal for a colonial union with regular meetings of delegates from all colonies, and with authority to settle such matters as disputes between colonies, the allocation of quotas of men and money in war time, and the like. Penn's plan was not adopted, and little further progress in the concept of union was made until 1754, when another spokesman of Pennsylvania, Benjamin Franklin, brought forward his Albany Plan of union. This scheme would have established "one general government . . . including all the . . . colonies," and would have had as its legislature a Grand Council with the voting strength of each colony in some degree proportionate to its population. Neither the colonies nor the Crown showed any enthusiasm for this plan, however, and the concept of inter-colonial cooperation remained an abstraction until the Stamp Act Congress of 1765 and the First and Second Continental Congresses of 1774 and 1775.

These assemblies were initially intended to be consultative bodies with no governmental power of any kind. This is quite clear from the credentials of the delegates: for instance, the Massachusetts members of the First Continental Congress were authorized only to meet with other delegates "to deliberate and determine upon wise and proper measures, to be by them recommended to all the colonies." A South Carolina delegate, John Rutledge, remarked that the Congress had "no coercive or legislative authority." But when war broke out the Second Congress, almost involuntarily, began to act. It appointed Washington commander in chief; it borrowed funds and supplemented this inadequate source of income by issuing paper money in the form of "Continental" notes. It spent its funds in the purchase of armament and supplies, and in the maintenance of a general "Continental Army." As far as possible it secured the consent of the separate colonies for what it had done, and it made no pretense either to permanence or to legal authority. Until 1776, it was in form merely a device to enable the colonies to coordinate their exertions in waging war; in function, it was already transacting business that is usually reserved for full-fledged governments.

With the assertion of independence, the question of union entered a new phase. Once the ties with England were broken, the new machinery of government could no longer be regarded as purely provisional, and, with the prospect of continued action by Congress both during and after the war, it became essential to create a legal basis of union. In fact, the twinship of the questions of independence and of union was suggested by the fact that Richard Henry Lee's original resolution in favor of independence, introduced on June 7, 1776, also contained a resolution that "a plan of confederation be prepared and transmitted to the respective Colonies for their consideration and approbation." On June 11 Congress appointed a committee to draw up a Declaration of Independence, and on June 12 a committee to draw up articles of confederation. But where the issue of independence was settled within a month, the formal sanction of a confederation required almost five years; for the Articles of Confederation, although agreed to by Congress on November 15, 1777, were not ratified by the last of the thirteen states until March 1, 1781.

The following selections will give some indication of the forces promoting or retarding the formation of the new union and of the character of the government which resulted from the operation of these forces.

A.

THE SPIRIT OF UNION AFTER INDEPENDENCE

The decision to declare independence from Britain not only gave an entirely new meaning to the question of union but also caused a realignment of the forces which supported strong union. In the period before July 4, 1776, the ardent revolutionists—men such as Patrick Henry and Samuel Adams—had taken the lead in proclaiming the solidarity of the colonies. They did this, because, to them, colonial solidarity appeared to be the best means of throwing off the central authority symbolized by the British Empire. But once independence was declared, the central authority which they most feared was the Continental Congress. Consequently they began, almost overnight, to view a firmer union not with enthusiasm but with distrust. On the other hand, the conservatives who had previously hesitated to strengthen continental solidarity so long as they cherished hopes of reconciliation with England, now felt that anarchy and complete disorder could be avoided only by placing some new central authority in the place of the British government. They became at once the champions of union.

Thus the issue of union remained a contested subject. At a time when independence had cleared the path for the establishment of a national form of government, it was still a question whether American national aspiration had developed strength enough to seize the opportunity. Recalling the mixture of local feeling and national feeling shown in the first Problem, one will find it useful to inquire what some of the leaders thought of the prospects of union during the latter part of the Revolution and to examine the attitude of some of the states at this same time.

1. *Washington's Appraisal of Unionism, 1780.* No one during the Revolution believed in the cause of American nationalism more firmly than George Washington. As military commander and later as civilian leader, he worked for it tirelessly. But at times the obstacles seemed insuperable. The preceding Problem has shown (p. 23) how, in the year of independence, the commander in chief struggled with local jealousies in the Army. In the two years after that, Washington held his forces together through the critical winters of Trenton and of Valley Forge, and by 1780 the military prospect seemed far brighter. But had the five-year experience of a common war effort knit the states closer together, and had the impulse toward union prospered with the success of American arms? Washington offered his reply to this question in a letter to Joseph Jones, a delegate from Virginia to the Continental Congress, May 31, 1780.¹

Certain I am that unless Congress speaks in a more decisive tone; unless they are vested with powers by the several States competent to the great purposes of War, or assume them as matter of right; and they, and the states respectively, act with more energy than they hitherto have done, that our Cause is lost. We can no longer drudge on in the old way. By ill-timing the adoption of measures, by delays in the execution of them, or by unwarrantable jealousies, we incur enormous expences, and derive no benefit from them. One state will comply with a requisition of Congress,

another neglects to do it. a third executes it by halves, and all differ either in the manner, the matter, or so much in point of time, that we are always working up hill, and ever shall be (while such a system as the present one, or rather want of one prevails) unable to apply our strength or resources to any advantage.

This my dear Sir is plain language to a member of Congress; but it is the language of truth and friendship. It is the result of long thinking, close application, and strict observation. I see one head gradually changing into thirteen. I see one Army branching into thirteen; and instead of looking up to Congress as the supreme controuling power of the united States, are considering themselves as dependent on their respective States. In a word, I see the powers of Congress declining too fast for the consequence and respect which is due to them as the grand representative body of America, and am fearful of the consequences of it.

Till your letter of the 23d. came to hand I thought General Weedon had actually resigned his Commission: but be this as it may, I see no possibility of giving him any command out of the line of his own State. He certainly knows that every state that has Troops enough to form a Brigade claims, and has exercised, uniformly, the privilege of having them commanded by a Brigr. of its own, nor is it in my power to depart from this system without convulsing the Army.

2. *Wilson's View.* Washington's comment shows not only what he believed to be the strength of unionist sentiment but also

whether it was increasing or decreasing as the end of the Revolution drew near. Another comment on this point is that of James Wilson of Pennsylvania. In a speech in the Constitutional Convention in 1787, he reviewed the fluctuating course of unionist feeling as he had observed it over the thirteen preceding years.²

Among the first sentiments expressed in the first Congs. one was that Virga. is no more, that Masss. is no [more], that Pa. is no more &c. We are now one nation of brethren. We must bury all local interests & distinctions. This language continued for some time. The tables at length began to turn. No sooner were the State Govts. formed than their jealousy & ambition began to display themselves. Each endeavoured to cut a slice from the common loaf, to add to its own morsel, till at length the confederation became frittered down to the impotent condition in which it now stands. Review the progress of the articles of Confederation thro' Congress & compare the first & last draught of it.

3. *Virginia as an "Independent Country."*

Both Washington and Wilson were reliable critics, but their statements were subjective expressions of disappointment at what they found, compared with what they had hoped for. Did they exaggerate when they declared that the spirit of unionism was being diminished, that the first enthusiasm for union had begun to flag? One person whose record throws light on this question is Patrick Henry. As a delegate to the Continental Congress in 1774, Henry had stressed his nationalism even to the point of calling himself "no longer a Virginian but an American." In 1778 he was governor of Virginia. By the time of his governorship, Virginia, acting independently of the Continental Congress, had sent an armed force under George Rogers Clark into the Illinois country to seize British posts at Kaskaskia and elsewhere. All this region was claimed by Virginia as part of her original grant from the king, and, with these claims to land along the Mississippi, Virginia was especially eager for an understanding with the Spanish who controlled the mouth of the river at New Orleans. Accordingly, Governor Henry wrote the following letter to the governor of Louisiana.³

. . . I inform Your Excellency that I am sending an express by the Mississippi in order that he may present himself to you to receive your orders. Colonel David Rogers will have the honor of delivering this letter into Your Excellency's hands, and of executing whatever is your pleasure to order in that river, which having an easy and safe

communication with the Gulf of Mexico, offers to us mutually communication between the vassals of His Catholic Majesty and the honored people of this State. I flatter myself that it will be found to be to the advantage of both. A State which is beginning to arise and which is engaged in a formidable war, suffers considerable needs and cannot solicit without great difficulty what it needs to maintain it vigorously. . . .

. . . The operations of the war with the English are so extensive that the expenses have increased beyond measure. This obliges me to ask Your Excellency whether it will be possible for you to aid this province by lending it any money, for instance one hundred and fifty thousand pistoles more or less, and what place will be the most convenient to receive it—whether at New Orleans, Havana, Cadiz or at any other place. Naturally your Excellency will desire to know what I have to give you as compensation for these loans. I shall answer "The thanks of this free and independent country, trade in one or in all its rich products, and the friendship of its brave inhabitants." Ignorant at the present time which of these things Your Excellency prefers, I offer them so that you may select those which are most pleasing to Your Excellency and the Spanish Nation.

4. *The South Carolina Constitution.* During 1778, the same year in which the Virginia governor was attempting his negotiation with Spain, the state of South Carolina adopted a new constitution. It had established an earlier one in 1776, but the Constitution of '78 was destined to remain in force somewhat longer. At the time when this instrument was adopted, South Carolina had ratified the Articles of Confederation, but since several other states had not, there was no formal basis of union, though the Congress was operating as usual. The Carolina constitution, in these circumstances, contained no references to the Union, though it did speak of the appointment of delegates to the Congress. A number of the provisions of this Constitution are interesting for what they indicate as to the Carolinians' conceptions of the power of the State government.⁴

I. That the style of this country be hereafter the State of South Carolina . . .

XXX. That all the officers in the army and navy of this State, of and above the rank of captain, shall be chosen by the senate and house of representatives [of the state] jointly, by ballot in the house of representatives, and commissioned by the governor and commander-in-chief, and that all other officers in the army and navy of this State

shall be commissioned by the governor and commander-in-chief. . . .

XXXIII. That the governor and commander-in-chief shall have no power to commence war, or conclude peace, or enter into any final treaty without the consent of the senate and house of representatives.

XXXVI. That all persons who shall be chosen and appointed to any office or to any place of trust, civil or military, before entering upon the execution of office, shall take the following oath: "I, A. B., do acknowledge the State of South Carolina to be a free, sovereign, and independent State, and that the people thereof owe no allegiance or obedience to George the Third, King of Great Britain, and I do renounce, refuse, and abjure any allegiance or obedience to him. And I do swear [or affirm, as the case may be] that I will, to the utmost of my power, support, maintain, and defend the said State against the said King George the Third, and his heirs and successors, and his or their abettors, assistants, and adherents, and will serve the said State in the office of ———, with fidelity and honor, and according to the best of my skill and understanding: So help me God."

5. *Control over Deserters as a Test.* In 1777 the Continental Congress had virtually assumed control of the armed forces. The Continental troops were recruited and commanded by officers holding Continental commissions; they were provisioned and paid, in so far as they received pay at all, under Congressional authority; their French military allies were bound to them by treaty made by Congress; and their commander, Washington, acted under the Congressional instructions.

When the problem of desertions from the army became serious, Congress naturally assumed that it had authority and responsibility to act, for clearly the right to recruit soldiers, to pay them, to command them, and to subject them to martial law, implied a right to punish them for desertion. In his zeal to make such punishment effective, one member of Congress proposed that local magistrates in the various states should be authorized to enforce the penalties imposed by Congress. This proposal involved certain fundamental concepts as to the relationship between the Congress and the states, and these concepts were fully debated on February 25, 1777, by Wilson of Pennsylvania and Thomas Burke of North Carolina. Burke himself wrote an account of the debate.⁵

A Report was taken up relative to Deserters. it stood Originally a recommendation of Congress to the several states to Enact Laws Empowering

all Constables Ferry keepers and Freeholders to take up persons suspected of being Deserters and carry them before any Justice of the Peace. An Amendment was moved the purport of which was that the Power should go Immediately from Congress—without the Intervention of the states. many Gentlemen were inattentive and it passed. The Delegate from North Carolina desired to be informed if he might enter his Protest against it. he was informed by the chair that he could not. he then desired to have his dissent entered on the Journal. declaring he was not Apprehensive of any Injury from it in the state he represented because he knew it would never be there observed the People too well knowing the Maxims of their Government, but that as it was as much as his Life was worth to consent to the Congress exercising such a Power, he desired that he might be able to prove from the Journals that he did not. he said it appeared to him that Congress was herein assuming a Power to give authority from themselves to persons within the States to sieze and Imprison the persons of the citizens and thereby to endanger the personal Liberty of every man in America. A motion was now made for reconsidering. on the reconsideration the Debate lay chiefly between Mr. Wilson of Pensylvania, and the North Carolina Delegate. Mr. Wilson argued that every object of Continental Concern was the subject of Continental Councils, that all Provisions made by the Continental Councils must be carried into execution by Continental authority. That the Army was certainly a Continental object, and preventing Desertion in it was certainly as Necessary an object as the raising of it, that nothing could be more Necessary to prevent Desertion than to take Effectual Measures for Apprehending Deserters, that this Power must Necessarily be in the Congress, and that they certainly had Power to authorise any persons in the states to put them in Execution. That the Power of taking up deserters was in every soldier and officers of the army, and that the Congress might make any Justice of Peace in any state such an Officer and thereby give him that Power, and if by making him an Officer they could give him that Power, they surely could without. that the officers and soldiers of the army were certainly not subject to the Laws of the states. That this was no more than what was every day done in appointing commissari[es] to purchase provisions and other things under the resolves of Congress. That the Congress had always directed their resolves to be put in Execution by Committees of Inspection and it was never denied that they had Power.

The Delegate of North Carolina answered that he admitted Continental objects were subjects of Continental Councils but denied that the provisions made by Continental Councils were to be

enforced by Continental authority. That it would be giving Congress a Power to prostrate all the Laws and Constitutions of the states because they might create a Power within each that must act entirely Independent of them, and might act directly contrary to them that they might by virtue of this Power render Ineffectual all the Barriers Provided in the states for the Security of the Rights of the Citizens for if they gave a Power to act coercively it must be against the subject of some State, and the subject of every state was entitled to the Protection of that particular state, and subject to the Laws of that alone, because to them alone did he give his consent, that he hoped the Gentleman would not Insist on this Principle which in its Nature was so very Extensive and alarming. That the states alone had Power to act coercively against their Citizens, and therefore were the only Power competent to carry into execution any Provisions whether Continental or Municipal. that he was well satisfied no Power on

Earth would ever obtain authority to act coercively against any of the Citizens of the state he represented except under their own Legislature; unless it was obtained by Violence. that His fellow Citizens were struggling against unlawful exertions of Power, and they would submit to them from no authority. that he admitted the army to be a proper object to be governed and directed by Continental Councils, and that it is proper the Congress should provide for punishing Desertion, and that Desertion was a very [great] evil, but that who is a Deserter or who is not is a Question that must be determined previous to any Punishment, and who ever can determin it has a Power over the Life and Liberty of the Citizens, for as much as any man may be accused of Desertion but every one accused may not be Guilty. that If the Congress has the Power to appoint any Person to decide this Question the Congress has Power unlimited over the Lives and Liberties of all men in America.

B. ADOPTING THE ARTICLES

It is an ironic fact that, although the idea of confederation was almost as old as that of independence, confederation was not formally adopted until the War of Independence was virtually over. As we have already seen, Congress appointed a committee to draw up articles of confederation even before independence was declared, and this committee, headed by John Dickinson, reported a draft on July 12, 1776.

The Dickinson draft contained many features that were retained in the Articles as finally adopted. It joined the "colonies" (later states) in a "confederacy" to be called the United States of America and bound them "to assist one another against all Force offered to or attacks made upon them or any of them." For the government of this Confederacy, it provided for a Congress on the pattern of the existing body, in which each state should have one vote. This Congress was intended to have charge of matters which were of general concern to all the states, and accordingly it was vested with the functions of conducting foreign relations and declaring peace and war, of controlling and directing the army and navy (except that army officers at and below the regimental level were to be appointed by the states), of adjudicating all disputes between the states, of maintaining a postal system, and of coining money, issuing currency, borrowing funds, and fixing the necessary expenses. These controls were supplemented by other provisions denying the states the right to treat with foreign countries or to declare war, and arranging for a council of state consisting of one delegate from each state to conduct the affairs of the Confederation when Congress was not in session.

In so far as this involved a recognition of the matters over which the central government ought to have control, it was farsighted and fairly sweeping. Indeed, it accurately foreshadowed the classic division between central and local affairs in the Constitution of 1787. But, though the sphere of authority was wisely defined, the creation of effective power to operate within this sphere was jealously withheld. Thus the vigor of the government was far less in actuality than it appeared to be—as Alexander Hamilton was to explain in an analysis, quoted below, of the "insufficiency of the present Confederation."

Limited as this authority was under the Dickinson draft, it was nevertheless enough to arouse the fears of those who dreaded centralized power. Congress deliberated over it for more than a year, making numerous changes which almost invariably served further to restrict the central authority. The Dickinson draft had proposed to reserve to each state "as much of its present laws, Rights, and Customs as it may think fit, and . . . the sole and exclusive Regulation and Government of its internal police," but Congress inserted

instead the far more sweeping assertion that "Each state retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence." The Dickinson draft had assigned to Congress unrestricted control over relations with the Indians and had also given to Congress power to limit the boundaries of states which claimed territory westward to the Pacific Ocean, or South Sea as it was then called. But on the floor of Congress, control over Indian affairs was limited in such a way as to protect "the legislative right of any state within its own limits," and the power to take over western land claims was eliminated altogether. The original plan had also set up a category of functions which could not be exercised by a simple majority but must await the support of nine states, and Congress added the appropriation of funds and the appointment of a commander in chief to this category.

The action of Congress in eliminating control over the western lands almost prevented the adoption of the Articles by the states, for some of the eastern states, such as Maryland, felt that the unsettled land beyond the Alleghenies was being won by the common war effort of all the states and that it should belong to all instead of being awarded to states which happened to hold lavish and anachronistic royal grants. Because of this feeling, several states were hesitant in giving their consent, and Maryland held back until March 1, 1781. Her ratification on that date put the Articles into effect as the first formal instrument of American union.

The selections will show something of (1) the feelings entertained by advocates of union while the Articles were being debated, (2) the issues which were raised during the debate, and (3) the prospects which the new union was believed to have at the time when Congress completed work on it.

1. *Hopes and Fears in 1776.* Less than a month after the Dickinson draft came before Congress, difficulties began to develop. These were stated in the correspondence of a number of the delegates. A letter by Joseph Hewes illustrates the misgivings of those who were present at the debates.⁶

[Joseph Hewes] . . . Much of our time is taken up in forming and debating a Confederation for the united States. what we shall make of it God only knows. I am inclined to think we shall never modell it so as to be agreed to by all the Colonies. a plan for foreign Alliances is also formed and I expect will be the subject of much debate before it is agreed to. these two Capital points ought to have been settled before our declaration of Independance went forth to the world. this was my opinion long ago and every days experience serves to confirm me in that opinion. I think it probable that we may Split on these great points, if so our mighty Colossus falls to pieces when (as our old friend Mr Gordon used to say) we shall be in a whimsical Situation.

2. *Sovereignty in the Separate States.* The same Thomas Burke who, in the debate over deserters, had denied that "Continental authority" was necessary for realizing "Continental objects" also objected to the fact that the Dickinson draft did not specifically guarantee the unqualified sovereignty of the states and only preserved "the exclusive regulation and government" by each state of "its internal police." Accordingly, he led an attack

on this provision, with results that are described in a letter which he sent to the governor of North Carolina.⁷

At present, nothing but executive business is done, except the Confederation, and on mere executive business there are seldom any debates; (and still more seldom any worth remembering). We have agreed to three articles: one containing the name: the second a declaration of the sovereignty of the States, and an express provision that they be considered as retaining every power not expressly delegated; and the third an agreement mutually to assist each other against every enemy. The first and latter passed without opposition or dissent, the second occasioned two days debate. It stood originally the third article; and expressed only a reservation of the power of regulating the internal police, and consequently resigned every other power. It appeared to me that this was not what the States expected, and, I thought, it left it in the power of the future Congress or General Council to explain away every right belonging to the States and to make their own power as unlimited as they please. I proposed, therefore an amendment, which held up the principle, that all sovereign power was in the States separately, and that particular acts of it, which should be expressly enumerated, would be exercised in conjunction, and not otherwise; but that in all things else each State would exercise all the rights and power of sovereignty, uncontrolled. This was at first so little understood that it was some time before it was seconded, and South Carolina first took it up. The opposition

was made by Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania, and Mr. R. H. Lee of Virginia: in the end however the question was carried for my proposition, eleven ayes, one no, and one divided. The no was Virginia; the divided, New Hampshire. I was much pleased to find the opinion of accumulating powers to Congress so little supported.

3. *The Articles Submitted to the States.*

When the modern student thinks of the Articles of Confederation, he does so with the knowledge that they ended in failure. Knowing this, he may think of their entire history as darkened by the shadow of ultimate abandonment. But to understand history it is important to put oneself in the place of the participants and to remember that they did not possess this knowledge of the outcome. Consequently they were disposed to regard the new union with an uncertainty which was a mixture of hope and fear. This uncertainty is suggested in a letter which Congress, on November 17, 1777, agreed to send to the states when it submitted the Articles for ratification.⁸ What inference may one draw from this letter as to the considerations that led advocates of effective union to fear for the results? In so far as they continued to be hopeful, what were the reasons upon which their hope was based?

Congress having agreed upon a plan of confederacy for securing the freedom, sovereignty, and independence of the United States, authentic copies are now transmitted for the consideration of the respective legislatures.

This business, equally intricate and important, has, in its progress, been attended with uncommon embarrassments and delay, which the most anxious solicitude and persevering diligence could not prevent. To form a permanent union, accommodated to the opinion and wishes of the delegates of so many states, differing in habits, produce, commerce, and internal police, was found to be a work which nothing but time and reflection, conspiring with a disposition to conciliate, could mature and accomplish.

Hardly is it to be expected that any plan, in the variety of provisions essential to our union, should exactly correspond with the maxims and political views of every particular State. Let it be remarked, that, after the most careful enquiry and the fullest information, this is proposed as the best which could be adapted to the circumstances of all; and as that alone which affords any tolerable prospect of a general ratification.

Permit us, then, earnestly to recommend these

articles to the immediate and dispassionate attention of the legislatures of the respective states. Let them be candidly reviewed under a sense of the difficulty of combining in one general system the various sentiments and interests of a continent divided into so many sovereign and independent communities, under a conviction of the absolute necessity of uniting all our councils and all our strength, to maintain and defend our common liberties: let them be examined with a liberality becoming brethren and fellow-citizens surrounded by the same imminent dangers, contending for the same illustrious prize, and deeply interested in being forever bound and connected together by ties the most intimate and indissoluble; and finally, let them be adjusted with the temper and magnanimity of wise and patriotic legislators, who, while they are concerned for the prosperity of their own more immediate circle, are capable of rising superior to local attachments, when they may be incompatible with the safety, happiness, and glory of the general Confederacy.

We have reason to regret the time which has elapsed in preparing this plan for consideration: with additional solicitude we look forward to that which must be necessarily spent before it can be ratified. Every motive loudly calls upon us to hasten its conclusion.

More than any other consideration, it will confound our foreign enemies, defeat the flagitious practices of the disaffected, strengthen and confirm our friends, support our public credit, restore the value of our money, enable us to maintain our fleets and armies, and add weight and respect to our councils at home, and to our treaties abroad.

In short, this salutary measure can no longer be deferred. It seems essential to our very existence as a free people, and without it we may soon be constrained to bid adieu to independence, to liberty and safety; blessings which, from the justice of our cause, and the favour of our Almighty Creator visibly manifested in our protection, we have reason to expect, if, in an humble dependence on his divine providence, we strenuously exert the means which are placed in our power.

To conclude, if the legislature of any State shall not be assembled, Congress recommend to the executive authority to convene it without delay; and to each respective legislature it is recommended to invest its delegates with competent powers ultimately in the name and behalf of the state to subscribe articles of confederation and perpetual union of the United States; and to attend Congress for that purpose on or before the tenth day of March next.

C.

THE ARTICLES IN OPERATION

For eight years, from 1781 to 1789, the union under the Articles remained in effect. During this period the United States experienced the dual stress of experimentation in government and adjustment to postwar conditions. It is evident that these factors produced some difficulty, and certain developments, such as the uprising of Daniel Shays in Massachusetts, or the uncontrolled inflation of the currency caused by the issue of legal-tender notes in some states indicated that conditions were not entirely stable. Yet it is a debatable and much-debated question whether the country was in serious distress and, if so, whether the distress resulted from the defects of the union or whether it was the natural and inescapable result of six years of war which had extended into every state. Some historians have contended that the distress was extreme and that it did result from the weakness of the union; others have argued that the spectacle of economic ruin and social anarchy was an illusion created by men who had reasons of their own for wanting to change the government. The point at issue may be regarded either as a pragmatic one—What shape was the country really in? How badly were remedial measures needed?—or it may be viewed as a problem in political science—To what extent did the Union possess the structural machinery and the functional powers which a central government needs in order to operate effectively?

1. *Benjamin Franklin on the State of the Union.* In January 1787, only five months before the meeting of the Constitutional Convention, the *American Museum*, a monthly magazine, published an article by Benjamin Franklin entitled "Comfort for America, or Remarks on Her Real Situation, Interests, and Policy."⁹ In evaluating Franklin's description of the economic condition of the country, one must remember that despite his comments here he soon became an enthusiastic supporter of the movement for a new Constitution.

I see in the public newspapers of different states, complaints of hard times, deadness of trade, scarcity of money, &c. &c.—It is not my intention to assert or maintain that these complaints are entirely without foundation. There is no country or nation existing, in which there will not be some people so circumstanced as to find it hard to gain a livelihood—people with whom money is scarce because they have nothing to give in exchange for it: and it is always in the power of a small number to make a great clamour. But let us take a cool view of the general state of our affairs, and perhaps the prospect will appear less gloomy than has been imagined.

The great business of the continent is agriculture. For one artisan, or merchant, I suppose we have at least a hundred farmers—by far the greatest part cultivators of their own fertile lands, from whence many of them draw not only food necessary for their subsistence, but the materials of their clothing, so as to need very few foreign supplies; while they have a surplus of productions to dispose, whereby wealth is gradually accumulated. Such has been the goodness of divine provi-

dence to these regions, and so favourable the climate, that since the three or four first years of hardships in the first settlement of our fathers here, a famine or scarcity has never been heard amongst us: on the contrary, though some years may have been more and others less plentiful, there has always been provision enough for ourselves, and a quantity to spare for exportation. And although the crops of late have been generally good, never was the farmer better paid for the part he spared for commerce, as the published prices current abundantly testify. The lands he possesses, are continually rising in value, with the increase of population. And on the whole, he is enabled to give such good wages to those who work for him, that all who are acquainted with the old world must agree that in no part of it are the labouring poor so generally well fed, well clothed, well lodged, and well paid as in America.

If we enter the cities, we find that since the revolution the owners of houses and lots of ground have had their interest vastly augmented in value: rents have risen to an astonishing height, and thence encouragement to increase building, which gives employment to an abundance of workmen, as does also the increased luxury and splendor of living of the inhabitants, thus made richer. These workmen all demand and obtain much higher wages than any other part of the world would afford them, and are paid in ready money. This rank of people, therefore, do not, or ought not, to complain of hard times; and they make a very considerable part of the city inhabitants.

At the distance I live from our American fisheries, I cannot speak of them with any certainty; but I have not heard that the labour of the valuable race of men who are employed in them, is worse paid for, or that they meet with less suc-

cess than they did before the revolution. The whalemens, indeed, have been deprived of one market for their oil: but another, I hear, is opening for them, which it is hoped may be equally advantageous. And the demand is constantly increasing for their spermaceti candles, which therefore bear a much higher price than formerly.

There remain the merchants and shopkeepers. Of these, tho' they make but a small part of the whole nation, the number is considerable—too great, indeed, for the business they are employed in: for the consumption of goods in every country has its limits. The faculties of the people (that is, their ability to buy and pay), are equal only to a certain quantity of merchandize. If merchants calculate amiss on this proportion, and import too much, they will of course find the sale dull for the overplus, and some of them will say that trade languishes.—They should, and doubtless will, grow wiser by experience, and import less. If too many artificers and farmers turn shopkeepers, the whole quantity of that business, divided amongst them, may afford too small a share for each, and occasion complaints that trade is dead. They may all suppose that it is owing to the scarcity of money, while, in fact, it is not so much from the fewness of buyers, as from the excessive number of sellers, that the mischief arises; and if every shopkeeper, farmer, and mechanic, would return to the use of his plough and working tools, there would remain of widows and other women shopkeepers sufficient for the business, which might then afford them a comfortable maintenance. Whoever has travelled through the various parts of Europe, and observed how small is the proportion of people in affluence or easy circumstances there, compared with those in poverty and misery; the few rich and haughty landlords, the multitude of poor, abject, rack-rented, tythe-paying tenants, and half-paid and half-starved labourers; and views here the happy mediocrity that so generally prevails throughout these states, where the cultivator works for himself, and supports his family in decent plenty, will, methinks, see abundant reason to bless divine providence for the evident and great difference in our favour, and be convinced that no nation known to us, enjoys a greater share of human felicity.

2. *John Jay on the State of the Union.* During 1788 when the Constitution had been proposed as an instrument of union to replace the Articles, John Jay of New York prepared an "Address" to the people of that state. In this plea for the Constitution, Jay discussed economic conditions under the Confederation.¹⁰

From this new and wonderful system of Government, it has come to pass, that almost every

national object of every kind, is at this day unprovided for; and other nations taking the advantage of its imbecility, are daily multiplying commercial restraints upon us. Our fur trade is gone to Canada, and British garrisons keep the keys of it. Our shipyards have almost ceased to disturb the repose of the neighborhood by the noise of the axe and hammer; and while foreign flags fly triumphantly above our highest houses, the American Stars seldom do more than shed a few feeble rays about the humble masts of river sloops and coasting schooners. The greater part of our hardy seamen, are plowing the ocean in foreign pay; and not a few of our ingenious shipwrights are now building vessels on alien shores. Although our increasing agriculture and industry extend and multiply our productions, yet they constantly diminish in value; and although we permit all nations to fill our country with their merchandises, yet their best markets are shut against us. Is there an English, or a French, or a Spanish island or port in the West-Indies, to which an American vessel can carry a cargo of flour for sale? Not one. The Algerines exclude us from the Mediterranean, and adjacent countries; and we are neither able to purchase, nor to command the free use of those seas. Can our little towns or larger cities consume the immense productions of our fertile country? or will they without trade be able to pay a good price for the proportion which they do consume? The last season gave a very unequivocal answer to these questions—What numbers of fine cattle have returned from this city to the country for want of buyers? What great quantities of salted and other provisions still lie useless in the stores? To how much below the former price, is our corn, and wheat and flour and lumber rapidly falling? Our debts remain undiminished, and the interest on them accumulating—our credit abroad is nearly extinguished, and at home unrestored—they who had money have sent it beyond the reach of our laws, and scarcely any man can borrow of his neighbor. Nay, does not experience also tell us, that it is as difficult to pay as to borrow? That even our houses and lands cannot command money—that law suits and usurious contracts abound—that our farms sell on executions for less than half their value, and that distress in various forms, and in various ways, is approaching fast to the doors of our best citizens.

3. *The Confederation and Foreign Trade.* Whenever economic ills were blamed upon the Articles, the condition of commerce and foreign trade received special emphasis. This issue was developed by Edmund Randolph in a letter in 1787 to the speaker of the Virginia House of Delegates, in which he explained the disadvantages in the situation of an aver-

age American merchant. The same point was also developed in quite a different way in an editorial in the *Hartford Connecticut Courant* which gave some statistics of foreign trade.¹¹

[*Randolph*] . . . No sooner is the merchant prepared for foreign ports, with the treasures which this new world kindly offers to his acceptance, than it is announced to him, that they are shut against American shipping, or opened under oppressive regulations. He urges congress to a counter-policy, and is answered only by a condescence on the general misfortune. He is immediately struck with the conviction, that until exclusion shall be opposed to exclusion, and restriction to restriction, the American flag will be disgraced. For who can conceive, that thirteen legislatures, viewing commerce under different regulations, and fancying themselves discharged from every obligation to concede the smallest of their commercial advantages for the benefit of the whole, will be wrought into a concert of action and defiance of every prejudice? Nor is this all: Let the great improvements be recounted, which have enriched and illustrated Europe: Let it be noted, how few those are, which will be absolutely denied to the United States, comprehending within their boundaries, the choicest blessings of climate, soil and navigable waters; then let the most sanguine patriot banish, if he can, the mortifying belief that all these must sleep, until they shall be roused by the vigor of a national government.

[*Connecticut Courant*] America, destined by nature to be the carrier of her own produce, yet tamely suffers this valuable branch of trade to be monopolized by foreigners. In the harbour of New-York, there are now 60 ships of which 55 are British. The produce of South Carolina was shipped in 170 ships of which 150 were British: The other Southern States freight their produce in the same proportion. In addition to the loss of being carriers of our own produce, we suffer greatly by the free importation of the gewgaws of Europe and many articles of produce. Our cheese and barley, which formerly realized a handsome income to the farmer, are now hawked about at an under price for a market. Surely there is not any American who regards the interest of his country but must see the immediate necessity of an efficient federal government; without it the Northern States will soon be depopulated and dwindle into poverty, while the Southern ones will become silk worms to toil and labour for Europe.

4. *The Federalist's Analysis of the Articles.* During the controversy over the adoption of the Constitution, numerous writers asserted that economic conditions were bad and that

defects in the governmental system had produced these conditions, but there were a few publicists who applied political science in their analysis of the shortcomings of the Articles. One of these few was Alexander Hamilton, who in 1787 joined with John Jay and James Madison to write for various New York newspapers that famous series of letters which was later collected in book form as *The Federalist*. In this classic commentary on the Constitution, Hamilton contributed the discussion of "the insufficiency of the present Confederation."¹²

We may indeed with propriety be said to have reached almost the last stage of national humiliation. There is scarcely anything that can wound the pride or degrade the character of an independent nation which we do not experience. Are there engagements to the performance of which we are held by every tie respectable among men? These are the subjects of constant and unblushing violation. Do we owe debts to foreigners and to our own citizens contracted in a time of imminent peril for the preservation of our political existence? These remain without any proper or satisfactory provision for their discharge. Have we valuable territories and important posts in the possession of a foreign power which, by express stipulations, ought long since to have been surrendered? These are still retained, to the prejudice of our interests, not less than of our rights. Are we in a condition to resent or to repel the aggression? We have neither troops, nor treasury, nor government. Are we even in a condition to remonstrate with dignity? The just imputations on our own faith, in respect to the same treaty, ought first to be removed. Are we entitled by nature and compact to a free participation in the navigation of the Mississippi? Spain excludes us from it. Is public credit an indispensable resource in time of public danger? We seem to have abandoned its cause as desperate and irretrievable. Is commerce of importance to national wealth? Ours is at the lowest point of declension. Is respectability in the eyes of foreign powers a safeguard against foreign encroachments? The imbecility of our government even forbids them to treat with us. Our ambassadors abroad are the mere pageants of mimic sovereignty. Is a violent and unnatural decrease in the value of land a symptom of national distress? The price of improved land in most parts of the country is much lower than can be accounted for by the quantity of waste land at market, and can only be fully explained by that want of private and public confidence, which are so alarmingly prevalent among all ranks, and which have a direct tendency to depreciate property of every kind. Is private credit the friend and

patron of industry? That most useful kind which relates to borrowing and lending is reduced within the narrowest limits, and this still more from an opinion of insecurity than from the scarcity of money. To shorten an enumeration of particulars which can afford neither pleasure nor instruction, it may in general be demanded, what indication is there of national disorder, poverty, and insignificance that could befall a community so peculiarly blessed with natural advantages as we are, which does not form a part of the dark catalogue of our public misfortunes? . . .

The great and radical vice in the construction of the existing Confederation is in the principle of LEGISLATION FOR STATES or GOVERNMENTS, in their CORPORATE or COLLECTIVE CAPACITIES, and as contradistinguished from the INDIVIDUALS of which they consist. Though this principle does not run through all the powers delegated to the Union, yet it pervades and governs those on which the efficacy of the rest depends. Except as to the rule of appointment, the United States has an indefinite discretion to make requisitions for men and money; but they have no authority to raise either, by regulations extending to the individual citizens of America. The consequence of this is, that though in theory their resolutions concerning those objects are laws, constitutionally binding on the members of the Union, yet in practice they are mere recommendations which the States observe or disregard at their option.

There is nothing absurd or impracticable in the idea of a league or alliance between independent nations for certain defined purposes precisely stated in a treaty regulating all the details of time, place, circumstance, and quantity; leaving nothing to future discretion; and depending for its execution on the good faith of the parties. Compacts of this kind exist among all civilized nations, subject to the usual vicissitudes of peace and war, of observance and non-observance, as the interests or passions of the contracting powers dictate.

If the particular States in this country are disposed to stand in a similar relation to each other, and to drop the project of a general DISCRETIONARY SUPERINTENDENCE, the scheme would indeed be pernicious, and would entail upon us all the mischiefs which have been enumerated under the first head; but it would have the merit of being, at least, consistent and practicable. Abandoning all views towards a confederate government, this would bring us to a simple alliance offensive and defensive; and would place us in a situation to be alternate friends and enemies of each other, as our mutual jealousies and rivalships, nourished by the intrigues of foreign nations, should prescribe to us.

But if we are unwilling to be placed in this perilous situation; if we still will adhere to the design of a national government, or, which is the same thing, of a superintending power, under the direction of a common council, we must resolve to incorporate into our plan those ingredients which may be considered as forming the characteristic difference between a league and a government; we must extend the authority of the Union to the persons of the citizens,—the only proper objects of government.

Government implies the power of making laws. It is essential to the idea of a law, that it be attended with a sanction; or, in other words, a penalty or punishment for disobedience. If there be no penalty annexed to disobedience, the resolutions or commands which pretend to be laws will, in fact, amount to nothing more than advice or recommendation. This penalty, whatever it may be, can only be inflicted in two ways: by the agency of the courts and ministers of justice, or by military force; by the COERCION of the magistracy, or by the COERCION of arms. The first kind can evidently apply only to men; the last kind must of necessity, be employed against bodies politic, or communities, or States. It is evident that there is no process of a court by which the observance of the laws can, in the last resort, be enforced. Sentences may be denounced against them for violations of their duty; but these sentences can only be carried into execution by the sword. In an association where the general authority is confined to the collective bodies of the communities, that compose it, every breach of the laws must involve a state of war; and military execution must become the only instrument of civil obedience. Such a state of things can certainly not deserve the name of government, nor would any prudent man choose to commit his happiness to it.

There was a time when we were told that breaches, by the States, of the regulations of the federal authority were not to be expected; that a sense of common interest would preside over the conduct of the respective members, and would beget a full compliance with all the constitutional requisitions of the Union. This language, at the present day, would appear as wild as a great part of what we now hear from the same quarter will be thought, when we shall have received further lessons from that best oracle of wisdom, experience. It at all times betrayed an ignorance of the true springs by which human conduct is actuated, and belied the original inducements to the establishment of civil power. Why has government been instituted at all? Because the passions of men will not conform to the dictates of reason and justice, without constraint. Has it been found that bodies of men act with more rectitude or greater disin-

terestedness than individuals? The contrary of this has been inferred by all accurate observers of the conduct of mankind; and the inference is founded upon obvious reasons. Regard to reputation has a less active influence, when the infamy of a bad action is to be divided among a number than when it is to fall singly upon one. A spirit of faction, which is apt to mingle its poison in the deliberations of all bodies of men, will often hurry the persons of whom they are composed into improprieties and excesses, for which they would blush in a private capacity.

In addition to all this, there is, in the nature

of sovereign power, an impatience of control, that disposes those who are invested with the exercise of it, to look with an evil eye upon all external attempts to restrain or direct its operations. From this spirit it happens, that in every political association which is formed upon the principle of uniting in a common interest a number of lesser sovereignties, there will be found a kind of eccentric tendency in the subordinate or inferior orbs, by the operation of which there will be a perpetual effort in each to fly off from the common centre.

Part II.

THE CONSTITUTION OF 1787

The life span of the union under the Articles was scarcely longer than the five-year period of gestation preceding its birth. Because of the difficulties indicated in the previous section, discontent mounted steadily and by 1786 was widespread enough to produce a general demand for a special convention of the states. When Virginia took the initiative in calling such a convention to meet at Annapolis, only five states attended, but these five adopted a report calling upon all the states to send delegates to a convention at Philadelphia in May 1787 to work out remedies for the defects in the government. As a formal courtesy the approval of Congress was invited and grudgingly given, but essentially the Philadelphia convention was created by forces working outside the existing government.

The Constitutional Convention began its sessions late in May and remained actively at work for more than three months with all the states except Rhode Island in attendance. On September 17 it completed its labors and sent the new Constitution to Congress to be transmitted to the states for ratification. Adoption would be effective upon ratification by the ninth state, and this was achieved when New Hampshire gave its adherence on June 21, 1788. The new government was thereupon put into process of organization, and Washington was inaugurated as President of the union under the Constitution on April 30, 1789. With certain amendments this Constitution has remained in effect ever since, and the American government is today one of the oldest in the world, although the nation is relatively young.

Probably no other nation under any government has ever grown and prospered as has the United States under the Constitution. Because of this success and because of the symbolic importance of the written charter in a country which has no royal family to serve as a focus of loyalty, the Constitution has become an object of veneration, almost of worship. The American political creed assumes that the Constitution is always right. Accordingly when any public man advocates a measure inconsistent with the Constitution his procedure is to pretend that no inconsistency exists rather than to challenge the merit of the Constitution on the point at issue. Hence the Constitution enjoys a certain immunity not only from adverse criticism but also from critical examination, even though it is a clearly evident fact that the workings of the instrument are sometimes unfortunate—for instance in the occasional governmental deadlocks that result from having a President and a Congress of diverse parties.

This deferential attitude toward the Constitution has to some extent stood in the way of a realistic appreciation of its merits as well as of its defects. It has seemed more respectful to treat the work of the framers as a testament of pure wisdom, a crystallization of abstract principles, than to recognize the down-to-earth nature of the problems which the framers confronted and the narrow limits within which they were obliged to move. Yet in reality most of what the Constitution did, it did because of the exigencies of an existing situation, and most of what it failed to do was omitted because of opposition which could not at that time be ignored.

The sections that follow are designed to give some insight into these realistic aspects. The first section contains material showing how the nationalists on one hand and the champions of the full power of the states on the other made their respective proposals to the Convention, and how that body contrived a compromise between national feeling and state loyalty. The second section contains material on the economic interests which disposed men to advocate or to oppose a stronger central authority. The third treats of the nature of the union under the Constitution, showing how skillfully the new frame of government was devised to reconcile the principle of collective strength with that of local freedom and to reconcile the rights of minorities, including economic minorities, with the principle of popular government.

A. THE ROLE OF THE STATES IN THE NEW UNION

By resolution of Congress, as well as by the action of the states in appointing delegates, the Constitutional Convention was authorized only to suggest amendments to the Articles of Confederation. This would have involved a fatal compromise with halfway measures, and it was fortunate for America that the framers decided to override these instructions and to come to grips with the essential questions. One vital decision, of course, had already been made under the Articles—the adoption of a division of powers along lines which would place general problems in the sphere of central government and local problems in the sphere of state government. But the Articles had not provided a general government with (1) the agencies necessary for handling such powers, (2) the controls necessary for enforcing them, and (3) any remedy for the fact that the states stood upon a perfect equality with one another in making decisions but were very unequal in their liability for men and money to execute such decisions.

The deliberations soon revealed that a general agreement existed on the treatment of the first two deficiencies but that a very sharp disagreement existed on the third. The extent of these agreements and disagreements is illustrated by the two principal plans of union which were submitted to the Convention. One of these was submitted by Edmund Randolph for the Virginia delegation. Virginia at that time exceeded all other states in area and population. The other was submitted by William Paterson for the New Jersey delegation. The major issues in the Convention were the ones raised by the differences between these plans. The states of large area or population tended to support the Virginia proposal; the smaller ones to rally behind the New Jersey resolutions. The primary triumph of the Convention was its adjustment of the clash between these proposals.

1. *The Randolph Plan.* Submitted to the Convention on May 29, 1787.¹³

1. Resolved that the Articles of Confederation ought to be so corrected & enlarged as to accomplish the objects proposed by their institution; namely, "common defence, security of liberty and general welfare."

[On the day after introducing this resolution, Randolph asked leave to postpone the consideration of it and to take up instead the following:

1. that a Union of the States merely federal will not accomplish the objects proposed by the articles of Confederation, namely common defence, security of liberty, & genl. welfare.

2. that no treaty or treaties among the whole or part of the States, as individual Sovereignities, would be sufficient.

3. that a *national* Government ought to be

established consisting of a *supreme* Legislative, Executive & Judiciary.]

2. Resd. therefore that rights of suffrage in the National Legislature ought to be proportioned to the Quotas of contribution, or to the number of free inhabitants, as the one or the other rule may seem best in different cases.

3. Resd. that the National Legislature ought to consist of two branches.

4. Resd. that the members of the first branch of the National Legislature ought to be elected by the people of the several States. . . .

5. Resold. that the members of the second branch of the National Legislature ought to be elected by those of the first. . . .

6. Resolved that each branch ought to possess the right of originating Acts; that the National Legislature ought to be empowered to enjoy the Legislative Rights vested in Congress by the Confederation & moreover to legislate in all cases to

which the separate States are incompetent, or in which the harmony of the United States may be interrupted by the exercise of individual Legislation; to negative all laws passed by the several States, contravening in the opinion of the National Legislature the articles of Union; and to call forth the force of the Union agst. any member of the Union failing to fulfill its duty under the articles thereof.

7. Resd. that a National Executive be instituted; to be chosen by the National Legislature for the term of years, . . . and that besides a general authority to execute the National laws, it ought to enjoy the Executive rights vested in Congress by the Confederation.

8. Resd. that the Executive and a convenient number of the National Judiciary, ought to compose a Council of revision with authority to examine every act of the National Legislature before it shall operate, & every act of a particular Legislature before a Negative thereon shall be final; and that the dissent of the said Council shall amount to a rejection, unless the Act of the National Legislature be again passed, or that of a particular Legislature be again negated by of the members of each branch.

9. Resd. that a National Judiciary be established to consist of one or more supreme tribunals, and of inferior tribunals to be chosen by the National Legislature, . . . that the jurisdiction of the inferior tribunals shall be to hear & determine in the first instance, and of the supreme tribunal to hear and determine in the dernier resort, all piracies & felonies on the high seas, captures from an enemy; cases in which foreigners or citizens of other States applying to such jurisdictions may be interested, or which respect the collection of the National revenue; impeachments of any National officers, and questions which may involve the national peace and harmony.

10. Resolvd. that provision ought to be made for the admission of States lawfully arising within the limits of the United States, whether from a voluntary junction of Government & Territory or otherwise, with the consent of a number of voices in the National legislature less than the whole.

11. Resd. that a Republican Government & the territory of each State, except in the instance of a voluntary junction of Government & territory, ought to be guarantied by the United States to each State. . . .

13. Resd. that provision ought to be made for the amendment of the Articles of Union whensoever it shall seem necessary, and that the assent of the National Legislature ought not to be required thereto.

14. Resd. that the Legislative Executive & Judiciary powers within the several States ought to be bound by oath to support the articles of Union

15. Resd. that the amendments which shall be offered to the Confederation, by the Convention ought at a proper time, or times, after the approbation of Congress to be submitted to an assembly or assemblies of Representatives, recommended by the several Legislatures to be expressly chosen by the people, to consider & decide thereon.

2. *The Paterson Plan.* Submitted to the Convention on June 15, 1787.¹⁴

1. Resd. that the articles of Confederation ought to be so revised, corrected & enlarged, as to render the federal Constitution adequate to the exigencies of Government, & the preservation of the Union.

2. Resd. that in addition to the powers vested in the U. States in Congress, by the present existing articles of Confederation, they be authorized to pass acts for raising a revenue, by levying a duty or duties on all goods or merchandizes of foreign growth or manufacture, imported into any part of the U. States, by Stamps on paper, vellum or parchment, and by a postage on all letters or packages passing through the general post-office, to be applied to such federal purposes as they shall deem proper & expedient; to make rules & regulations for the collection thereof; and the same from time to time, to alter & amend in such manner as they shall think proper: to pass Acts for the regulation of trade & commerce as well with foreign nations as with each other: provided that all punishments, fines, forfeitures & penalties to be incurred for contravening such acts rules and regulations shall be adjudged by the Common law Judiciaries of the State in which any offence contrary to the true intent & meaning of such Acts rules & regulations shall have been committed or perpetrated, with liberty of commencing in the first instance all suits & prosecutions for that purpose in the superior common law Judiciary in such State, subject nevertheless, for the correction of all errors, both in law & fact in rendering Judgment, to an appeal to the Judiciary of the U. States.

3. Resd. that whenever requisitions shall be necessary, instead of the rule for making requisitions mentioned in the articles of Confederation, the United States in Congs. be authorized to make such requisitions in proportion to the whole number of white & other free citizens & inhabitants of every age sex and condition including those bound to servitude for a term of years & three fifths of all other persons not comprehended in the foregoing description, except Indians not paying taxes; that if such requisitions be not complied with, in the time specified therein, to direct the collection thereof in the non complying States & for that purpose to devise and pass acts directing & authorizing the same; provided that none of

the powers hereby vested in the U. States in Congs. shall be exercised without the consent of at least States, and in that proportion if the number of Confederated States should hereafter be increased or diminished.

4. Resd. that the U. States in Congs. be authorized to elect a federal Executive to consist of persons, to continue in office for the term of years, . . . that the Executives besides their general authority to execute the federal acts ought to appoint all federal officers not otherwise provided for, & to direct all military operations; provided that none of the persons composing the federal Executive shall on any occasion take command of any troops, so as personally to conduct any enterprise as General or in other capacity.

5. Resd. that a federal Judiciary be established to consist of a supreme Tribunal the Judges of which to be appointed by the Executive, & to hold their offices during good behaviour, . . . that the Judiciary so established shall have authority to hear & determine in the first instance on all impeachments of federal officers, & by way of appeal in the dernier resort in all cases touching the rights of Ambassadors, in all cases of captures from an enemy, in all cases of piracies & felonies on the high Seas, in all cases in which foreigners may be interested, in the construction of any treaty or treaties, or which may arise on any of the Acts for regulation of trade, or the collection of the federal Revenue: that none of the Judiciary shall during the time they remain in office be capable of receiving or holding any other office or appointment during their time of service, or for thereafter.

6. Resd. that all Acts of the U. States in Congs. made by virtue & in pursuance of the powers hereby & by the articles of Confederation vested in them, and all Treaties made & ratified under the authority of the U. States shall be the supreme law of the respective States so far forth as those Acts or Treaties shall relate to the said States or their Citizens, and that the Judiciary of the several States shall be bound thereby in their decisions, any thing in the respective laws of the Individual States to the contrary notwithstanding; and that if any State, or any body of men in any State shall oppose or prevent the carrying into execution such acts or treaties, the federal Executive shall be authorized to call forth ye. power of the Confederated States, or so much thereof as may be necessary to enforce and compel an obedience to such Acts, or an observance of such Treaties.

7. Res. that provision be made for the admission of new States into the Union.

8. Res. the rule for naturalization ought to be the same in every State.

9. Res. that a Citizen of one State committing an offense in another State of the Union, shall be

deemed guilty of the same offense as if it had been committed by a Citizen of the State in which the offense was committed.

3. *The Plans Debated.* The debates on the Randolph and Paterson Plans did much to clarify the basic points at issue and to show why the several states maintained their respective positions. The following brief selections make use of speeches by William Samuel Johnson of Connecticut to define the issue, by Paterson to explain his position, and by Alexander Hamilton and James Madison to show the views of the supporters of the Virginia Plan.¹⁵

[Johnson] On a comparison of the two plans which had been proposed from Virginia & N. Jersey, it appeared that the peculiarity which characterized the latter was its being calculated to preserve the individuality of the States. The plan from Va. did not profess to destroy this individuality altogether, but was charged with such a tendency. One Gentleman alone (Col. Hamilton) in his animadversions on the plan of N. Jersey, boldly and decisively contended for an abolition of the State Govts. Mr. Wilson & the gentlemen from Virga. who also were adversaries of the plan of N. Jersey held a different language. They wished to leave the States in possession of a considerable, tho' a subordinate jurisdiction. They had not yet however shewn how this cd. consist with, or be secured agst. the general sovereignty & jurisdiction, which they proposed to give to the national Government. If this could be shewn in such a manner as to satisfy the patrons of the N. Jersey propositions, that the individuality of the States would not be endangered, many of their objections would no doubt be removed. If this could not be shewn their objections would have their full force.

[Paterson] Mr. Patterson considered the proposition for a proportional representation as striking at the existence of the lesser States. He wd. premise however to an investigation of this question some remarks on the nature structure and powers of the Convention. The Convention he said was formed in pursuance of an Act of Congs. that this act was recited in several of the Commissions, particularly that of Massts. which he required to be read: that the amendment of the confederacy was the object of all the laws and commissions on the subject; that the articles of the Confederation were therefore the proper basis of all the proceedings of the Convention. We ought to keep within its limits, or we should be charged by our Constituents with usurpation, . . . But the Commissions under which we acted were not only the measure of our power, they denoted also the

sentiments of the States on the subject of our deliberation. The idea of a national Govt. as contradistinguished from a federal one, never entered into the mind of any of them, and to the public mind we must accomodate ourselves. We have no power to go beyond the federal scheme, and if we had the people are not ripe for any other. A confederacy supposes sovereignty in the members composing it & sovereignty supposes equality. If we are to be considered as a nation, all State distinctions must be abolished, the whole must be thrown into hotchpot, and when an equal division is made, then there may be fairly an equality of representation. He said there was no more reason that a great individual State contributing much, should have more votes than a small one contributing little, than that a rich individual citizen should have more votes than an indigent one. If the rateable property of A was to that of B as 40 to 1, ought A for that reason to have 40 times as many votes as B. Such a principle would never be admitted, and if it were admitted would put B entirely at the mercy of A. As A. has more to be protected than B so he ought to contribute more for the common protection. The same may be said of a large State wch. has more to be protected than a small one. Give the large States an influence in proportion to their magnitude, and what will be the consequence? Their ambition will be proportionally increased, and the small States will have every thing to fear.

[Wilson] He entered elaborately into the defence of a proportional representation, stating for his first position that as all authority was derived from the people, equal numbers of people ought to have an equal no. of representatives, and different numbers of people different numbers of representatives. Are not the Citizens of Pena. equal to those of N. Jersey? does it require 150 of the former to balance 50 of the latter? Representatives of different districts ought clearly to hold the same proportion to each other, as their respective Constituents hold to each other. If the small States will not confederate on this plan, Pena. & he presumed some other States, would not confederate on any other. We have been told that each State being sovereign, all are equal. So each man is naturally a sovereign over himself, and all men are therefore naturally equal. Can he retain this equality when he becomes a member of Civil Government? He can not. As little can a Sovereign State, when it becomes a member of a federal Govt. If N. J. will not part with her Sovereignty it is in vain to talk of Govt.

[Hamilton] . . . as States are a collection of individual men which ought we to respect most, the rights of the people composing them, or of the

artificial beings resulting from the composition. Nothing could be more preposterous or absurd than to sacrifice the former to the latter. It has been sd. that if the smaller States renounce their *equality*, they renounce at the same time their *liberty*. The truth is it is a contest for power, not for liberty. Will the men composing the small States be less free than those composing the larger. The State of Delaware having 40,000 souls will *lose power*, if she has 1/10 only of the votes allowed to Pa. having 400,000: but will the people of Del: *be less free*, if each citizen has an equal vote with each citizen of Pa.

[Madison] Were it practicable for the Genl. Govt. to extend its care to every requisite object without the cooperation of the State Govts. the people would not be less free as members of one great Republic than as members of thirteen small ones. A Citizen of Delaware was not more free than a Citizen of Virginia: nor would either be more free than a Citizen of America. Supposing therefore a tendency in the Genl. Government to absorb the State Govts. no fatal consequence could result.

4. *Compromise*. The bitter contest between advocates of the New Jersey and the Virginia Plans finally brought about a situation where it was clear that, if either Plan were adopted, its opponents would fight against the finished Constitution and would almost certainly prevent its ratification. To prevent disruption of the whole project, compromise seemed necessary. The nature of the compromise proposed and adopted is shown in extracts from Madison's notes on speeches by Johnson of Connecticut, Oliver Ellsworth, also of Connecticut, and Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts, and in the report of a special committee appointed to deal with this question.¹⁶

[Johnson] On the whole he thought that as in some respects the States are to be considered in their political capacity, and in others as districts of individual citizens, the two ideas embraced on different sides, instead of being opposed to each other, ought to be combined; that in *one* branch the *people*, ought to be represented; in the *other* the *States*.

[Ellsworth] Mr. Ellsworth moved that the rule of suffrage in the 2d. branch be the same with that established by the articles of confederation. We were partly national; partly federal. The proportional representation in the first branch was conformable to the national principle & would secure the large States agst. the small. An equality of voices was conformable to the federal principle and was necessary to secure the Small States agst. the large. He trusted that on this middle ground

a compromise would take place. He did not see that it could on any other. And if no compromise should take place, our meeting would not only be in vain but worse than in vain.

[Gerry] We were . . . in a peculiar situation. We were neither the same Nation nor different Nations. We ought not therefore to pursue the one or the other of these ideas too closely.

[Committee Report] The Committee . . . submit the following Report: That the subsequent propositions be recommended to the Convention on condition that both shall be generally adopted. I. that in the 1st branch of the Legislature each

of the States now in the Union shall be allowed 1 member for every 40,000 inhabitants of the description reported in the 7th Resolution of the Come. of the whole House: that each State not containing that number shall be allowed 1 member: that all bills for raising or appropriating money, and for fixing the Salaries of the officers of the Govern't. of the U. States shall originate in the 1st branch of the Legislature, and shall not be altered or amended by the 2d. branch: and that no money shall be drawn from the public Treasury. but in pursuance of appropriations to be originated in the 1st branch II. That in the 2d. branch each State shall have an equal vote.

B.

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF THE NEW UNION

In a sense the whole issue between the Virginia and New Jersey Plans was illusory. Even when the contest was being waged, men of insight such as James Madison pointed out that there was no real clash of interests between the large states as a group and the small states as a group. Maryland, though "small," shared with Virginia an economy of plantations—slave labor and tobacco culture. Similarly the commercial interests of Connecticut and Massachusetts were alike. Physical realities caused each state to affiliate politically with other states of similar economic interests and not with states which happened to be of similar dimensions or population. Consequently the large states as such have never been uniformly aligned against the small. But if this issue was largely fictitious, there were other issues which were much more genuine. The sectional issue was one of these, for the interests of the southern states conflicted at some points with the interests of the northern, and divisions in Congress sometimes followed sectional lines. Accordingly the question of including slaves in the basis of representation bore a genuine significance in fixing the strength of potential rivals, and the compromise which allowed the South to count the Negroes at three fifths of their numerical strength marked an important sectional adjustment.

Similarly there were issues before the Convention which involved neither states nor sections but economic interests. The effect of the proposed Constitution upon these interests and their consequent reaction is shown in the following selections and needs no description here. But as a preliminary it is useful to note the principal forms of property which existed in America at that time. The most prevalent was that of landownership, mostly by small farmers. The farmer of that period, unlike the agriculturist of today who produces for market, was not a rural businessman but, to a large extent, was a subsistence cultivator whose living came principally from his own soil and who received hardly any cash income. He could not bear the burden of substantial taxes, and, though chronically prone to fall into a debtor relationship, he was ill prepared to carry any burden of debt. Consequently, although he was nominally a man of property, his hostility to the property rights of his creditor often outweighed his concern for his own property rights as a landowner.

In addition to this class of property, there were other more specialized but nevertheless important property interests. One of these was the ownership of land in the unsettled area beyond the Alleghenies. By treaty of peace at the end of the Revolution, the United States had won the whole region west to the Mississippi. At the time of the treaty the several states had held claims to the entire trans-Allegheny region, and, with their treasuries exhausted, they had widely resorted to the use of land grants as a substitute for money. Soldiers were often paid with grants of land. But the value of this land remained contingent upon the British evacuation of the entire region and upon the Indians being kept in order. Yet the government under the Articles was not strong enough to induce the British to leave nor solvent enough to raise and maintain an armed force to cope with the Indians. Hence western land titles remained almost valueless.

Another form of property consisted of shipping or, if not of shipping, of warehouses or other property used in foreign commerce. In one respect, independence had hurt American commerce, for it automatically deprived American shipowners of the right which they had enjoyed as colonists to trade in British ports. Independence made them foreigners and thus subjected them to disadvantages of the kind pointed out by Edmund Randolph in the selection above. Shipowners as a class, therefore, had reason to look with favor upon any project for strengthening the government.

A third class of persons whose property interests were affected by the political situation were those who had bought what would today be called government bonds. But these bonds were in default and seemed unlikely ever to be paid by a government which, as Hamilton had observed, had no authority to raise money.

In addition to this special class of government creditors, there was also a general creditor class consisting of all persons to whom money was owed. Although not the victims of government default, people in this group also found their equities in danger. Many of the states had inflated the currency by the unlimited issue of paper money, with the result that loans made in money units of genuine value could be repaid in units of almost no value and creditors, it was said, went into hiding to prevent their debtors from paying them. Moreover, some of the state governments had gone to the relief of debtors by enacting "stay" laws which prevented creditors from foreclosing mortgages or otherwise taking steps to collect their obligations. In the light of this situation, creditors were likely to approve when they found in the new Constitution provisions that "No state shall . . . emit bills of credit; make anything but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts."

Because of these factors in the situation the purely political issue of nationalism versus localism became to some extent enmeshed with economic issues involving commerce versus agriculture and creditor versus debtor. These issues were not especially evident in the Convention itself, for there the delegates in general agreed upon the desirability of having a government strong enough to occupy the western lands, negotiate trade treaties, pay its debts, and restrain the states from debasing the currency or nullifying contracts. But outside the Convention the various economic interests divided sharply and in a way that almost caused the defeat of the Constitution.

The selections show how economic considerations influenced the alignment for and against the Constitution. They will suggest too that the victory of the Constitution was not purely the victory of nationalism over localism. It is an easy and, for some purposes, a legitimate concept to think of a nation as a corporate unit consisting of citizen members who are equally ready to subordinate their personal advantage to the national interest and equally benefited by the national protection. But a realistic analysis must recognize that a nation is made up of several million individual members, varying in the degree of loyalty, varying in the degree to which they are benefited by the operation of the government, varying in the extent to which they are willing to give loyalty without receiving benefit. As a general condition, with brilliant individual exceptions, national loyalty tends to be enhanced in those groups which gain advantage from the policies of the nation and to be diminished in those groups which are affected adversely. A recognition of this fact is essential if one is to understand why national feeling advanced so rapidly in some parts of the new union and so slowly in other parts during the next seven decades.

1. *Appeals to Economic Motive.* In June 1787, before the Constitutional Convention had completed its work, the *American Museum* published an address by "Harrington" to the "Freemen of America." This address urged support for a stronger government and in doing so it appealed specifically to a number of economic interests.¹⁷

Let the states, who are jealous of each others' competitions and encroachments, whether in commerce or territory, or who have suffered under aristocratic or democratic jundos, come forward,

and first throw their sovereignty at the feet of the convention. It is there only that they can doom their disputes, their unjust tender and commutation laws, their paper-money, their oppressive taxes upon land, and their partial systems of finance, to destruction.

Let the public creditor, who lent his money to his country, and the soldier and citizen, who yielded their services, come forward next, and contribute their aid to establish an effective federal government. It is from the united power and resources of America only, that they can expect permanent and substantial justice.

Let the lovers of peace add their efforts to those that have been mentioned, in increasing the energy of a federal government. An assembly of the states, alone, by the terror of its power, and the fidelity of its engagements, can preserve a perpetual peace with the nations of Europe.

Let the citizens of America, who inhabit the western counties of our states, fly to a federal power for protection. The Indians know too well the dreadful consequences of confederacy in arms, ever to disturb the peaceful husbandman, who is under the cover of the arsenals of thirteen states.

Let the farmer, who groans beneath the weight of direct taxation, seek relief from a government, whose extensive jurisdiction will enable it to extract the resources of our country by means of imposts and customs.

Let the merchant, who complains of the restrictions and exclusions imposed upon his vessels by foreign nations, unite his influence in establishing a power that shall retaliate those injuries, and insure him success in his honest pursuits, by a general system of commercial regulations.

Let the manufacturer and mechanic, who are everywhere languishing for want of employment, direct their eyes to an assembly of the states. It will be in their power only to encourage such arts and manufactures as are essential to the prosperity of our country.

2. *Hamilton on Economic Alignments.* During the same month in which the Convention finished its work, Alexander Hamilton committed to writing his estimate of the factors which would determine the adoption or the defeat of the Constitution.¹⁸

The new Constitution has in favor of its success these circumstances: A very great weight of influence of the persons who framed it, particularly in the universal popularity of General Washington. The good-will of the commercial interest throughout the States, which will give all its efforts to the establishment of a government capable of regulating, protecting, and extending the commerce of the Union. The good-will of most men of property in the several States, who wish a government of the Union able to protect them against domestic violence, and the depredations which the democratic spirit is apt to make on property, and who are besides anxious for the respectability of the nation. The hopes of the creditors of the United States, that a general government possessing the means of doing it, will pay the debt of the Union. A strong belief in the people at large of the insufficiency of the present Confederation to preserve the existence of the Union, and of the necessity of the Union to their safety and prosperity; of course, a strong desire of

a change, and a predisposition to receive well the propositions of the convention.

Against its success is to be put the dissent of two of [or:] three important men in the convention, who will think their characters pledged to defeat the plan: the influence of many *inconsiderable* men in possession of considerable offices under the State governments, who will fear a diminution of their consequence, power, and emolument, by the establishment of the general government, and who can hope for nothing there; the influence of some *considerable* men in office, possessed of talents and popularity, who, partly from the same motives, and partly from a desire of *playing a part* in a convulsion for their own aggrandizement, will oppose the quiet adoption of the new government (some considerable men out of office, from motives of ambition, may be disposed to act the same part). Add to these causes the disinclination of the people to taxes, and of course to a strong government; the opposition of all men much in debt, who will not wish to see a government established, one object of which is to restrain the means of cheating creditors; the democratical jealousy of the people, which may be alarmed at the appearance of institutions that may seem calculated to place the power of the community in few hands, and to raise a few individuals to stations of great pre-eminence; and the influence of some foreign powers, who, from different motives, will not wish to see an energetic government established throughout the States.

3. *Geography and Constitutional Alignments.* During the contest over ratification of the Constitution in Massachusetts, a writer signing himself "Cornelius" sent to the *Hampshire Chronicle* of December 11 and 18, 1787, two letters which reflected very plainly the distrust in rural districts of the position which seaport communities would occupy under the new Constitution.¹⁹

. . . the Congress are also vested with the power of prescribing, not only the times and manner of holding elections for Senators; but, the times, manner and *places* of holding elections for Representatives. There is undoubtedly, some interesting and important design in the Congress being by the Constitution, thus particularly vested with this discretionary power of controuling elections. Will it be urged that, as to such particular times and *places* for holding elections as may be most convenient for the several States, the Congress will be more competent judges than the citizens themselves, or their respective legislatures? This surely will not be pretended. The end then of placing this power in the hands of the Congress, cannot have been, the greater convenience of the citizens who are interested and concerned in those

elections. But whatever may have been the *design*, it is very easy to see that a very interesting and important use may be made of this power; and I can conceive of but one reason why it should be vested in the Congress; particularly as it relates to the *places* of holding elections for Representatives. This power being vested in the Congress may enable them, from time to time, to throw the elections into such particular parts of the several States where the dispositions of the people shall appear to be the most subservient to the wishes and views of that honourable body; or, where the interests of the major part of the members may be found to lie. Should it so happen (as it probably will) that the major part of the Members of Congress should be elected in, and near the seaport towns; there would, in that case, naturally arise strong inducements for fixing the places for holding elections in such towns, or within their vicinity. This would effectually exclude the distant parts of the several States, and the bulk of the landed interest, from an equal share in that government, in which they are deeply interested.

There is nothing in the constitution that determines what shall be considered as an election of a Representative. The Representatives are to be chosen by the people; and where there are a number to be chosen, it is, perhaps, not very likely that any one gentleman will have a majority of all the votes. Those who may appear to have the greatest number of votes must, therefore be considered as being elected.—I wish there never might be any competition between the landed and mercantile interests, nor between any different classes of men whatever. Such competitors will, however, exist, so long as occasion and opportunity for it is given, and while human nature remains the same that it ever has been. The citizens in the seaport towns are numerous; they live compact; their interests are one; there is a constant connection and intercourse between them; they can, on any occasion, centre their votes where they please. This is not the case with those who are in the landed interest; they are scattered far and wide; they have but little intercourse and connection with each other. To concert uniform plans for carrying elections of this kind is intirely out of their way. Hence, their votes if given at all, will be no less scattered than are the local situations of the voters themselves. Wherever the seaport towns agree to centre their votes, there will, of course, be the greatest number. A gentleman in the country therefore, who may aspire after a seat in Congress, or who may wish for a post of profit under the federal government, must form his connections, and unite his interest with those towns. Thus, I conceive, a foundation is laid for throwing the whole power of the federal government into the hands of those who are in the

mercantile interest; and for the landed, which is the great interest of this country to lie unrepresented, forlorn and without hope.

4. *Special Appeals to the Landholding Class.*

The two preceding selections have shown that the advantage of the Constitution for landowners was by no means so self-evident as for other classes. Friends of the Constitution recognized a special need to appeal to the landed class. Accordingly, when Oliver Ellsworth wrote for the *Connecticut Courant* a series of letters in support of the Constitution, he signed himself "Landholder" and began with a direct appeal to this interest (November 5, 1787).²⁰

To the Holders and Tillers of Land. The writer of the following passed the first part of his life in mercantile employments, and by industry and economy acquired a sufficient sum on retiring from trade to purchase and stock a decent plantation, on which he now lives in the state of a farmer. By his present employment he is interested in the prosperity of agriculture, and those who derive a support from cultivating the earth. An acquaintance with business has freed him from many prejudices and jealousies, which he sees in his neighbors, who have not intermingled with mankind, nor learned by experience the method of managing an extensive circulating property. Conscious of an honest intention he wishes to address his brethren on some political subjects which now engage the public attention, and will in the sequel greatly influence the value of landed property. . . .

It proves the honesty and patriotism of the gentlemen who composed the general Convention, that they chose to submit their system to the people rather than the legislatures, whose decisions are often influenced by men in the higher departments of government, who have provided well for themselves and dread any change least they should be injured by its operation. I would not wish to exclude from a State Convention those gentlemen who compose the higher branches of the assemblies in the several states, but choose to see them stand on an even floor with their brethren, where the artifice of a small number cannot negative a vast majority of the people.

. . . It may be assumed as a fixed truth that the prosperity and riches of the farmer must depend on the prosperity, and good national regulation of trade. Artful men may insinuate the contrary—tell you let trade take care of itself, and excite your jealousy against the merchant because his business leads him to wear a gayer coat, than your economy directs. But let your own experience refute such insinuations. Your property and riches depend on a ready demand and generous price

for the produce you can annually spare. When and where do you find this? Is it not where trade flourishes, and when the merchant can freely export the produce of the country to such parts of the world as will bring the richest return? When the merchant doth not purchase, your produce is low, finds a dull market—in vexation you call the trader a jocky, and curse the men whom you ought to pity. A desire of gain is common to mankind, and the general motive to business and industry. You cannot expect many purchases when trade is restricted, and your merchants are shut out from nine-tenths of the ports in the world. While you depend on the mercy of foreign nations, you are the first persons who will be humbled. Confined to a few foreign ports they must sell low, or not at all; and can you expect they will greedily buy in at a high price, the very articles which they must sell under every restriction.

Every foreign prohibition on American trade is aimed in the most deadly manner against the holders and tillers of the land, and they are the men made poor. Your only remedy is such a national government as will make the country respectable; such a supreme government as can boldly meet the supremacy of proud and self-interested nations. The regulation of trade ever was and ever will be a national matter. A single state in the American union cannot direct much less control it. This must be a work of the whole, and requires all the wisdom and force of the continent, and untill it is effected our commerce may be insulted by every overgrown merchant in Europe. Think not the evil will rest on your merchants alone; it may distress them, but it will destroy those who cultivate the earth. Their produce will bear a low price, and require bad pay; the laborer will not find employment; the value of lands will fall, and the landholder become poor.

While our shipping rots at home by being prohibited from ports abroad, foreigners will bring you such articles and at such price as they please. Even the necessary article of salt has the present year, been chiefly imported in foreign bottoms, and you already feel the consequence, your flaxseed in barter has not returned you more than two-thirds of the usual quantity. From this beginning learn what is to come.

5. *Bills of Credit and Federal Authority.* In the debate over ratification, the power to prevent the states from issuing paper notes or adopting "stay" laws was not much emphasized. Advocates of the Constitution probably did not care to draw attention to this power, and opponents perhaps hesitated to admit that this was the basis of their opposition. But

Alexander Contee Hanson, a member of the Maryland state convention, writing as "Aristides," published "Remarks on the Proposed Plan of a Federal Government," in which he commented with insight on this aspect of the contest.²¹

The restraints laid on the state legislatures will tend to secure domestic tranquility, more than all the bills, or declarations, of rights, which human policy could devise. It is very justly asserted, that the plan contains an avowal of many rights. It provides that no man, shall suffer by ex post facto laws or bills of attainder. It declares, that gold and silver only shall be a tender for specie debts; and that no law shall impair the obligation of a contract.

I have here perhaps touched a string, which secretly draws together many of the foes to the plan. Too long have we sustained evils, resulting from injudicious emissions of paper, and from the operation of tender laws. To bills of credit as they are now falsely called, may we impute the entire loss of confidence between men. Hence it is, that specie has, in a great degree, ceased its proper office, and been confined to speculations, baneful to the public, and enriching a few enterprising sharp-sighted men, at the expence not only of the ignorant, slothful, and needy, but of their country's best benefactors. Hence chiefly are the bankruptcies throughout America, and the disreputable ruinous state of our commerce. Hence is it principally, that America hath lost its credit abroad, and American faith become a proverb. The convention plainly saw, that nothing short of a renunciation of the right to emit bills of credit could produce that grand consummation of policy, the RESTORATION OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE FAITH.

6. *Lee on Economic Alignments.* Among the critics of the proposed Constitution was Richard Henry Lee of Virginia who stated his views in a series of "Letters of the Federal Farmer" in October 1787. Lee did not oppose the new plan *in toto* but insisted that it ought to be amended. Although written to plead a cause, his letters contained some very judicious observations on the special economic interests at work and the position of the community as a whole in relation to these interests.²²

. . . During the war, the general confusion, and the introduction of paper money, infused in the minds of people vague ideas respecting government and credit. We expected too much from the return of peace, and of course we have been disappointed. Our governments have been new and unsettled; and several legislatures, by making ten-

der, suspension, and paper money laws, have given just cause of uneasiness to creditors. By these and other causes, several orders of men in the community have been prepared, by degrees, for a change of government; and this very abuse of power in the legislatures, which in some cases has been charged upon the democratic part of the community, has furnished aristocratical men with those very weapons, and those very means, with which, in great measure, they are rapidly effecting their favourite object. And should an oppressive government be the consequence of the proposed change, prosperity [posterity?] may reproach not only a few overbearing, unprincipled men, but those parties in the states which have misused their powers.

The conduct of several legislatures, touching paper money, and tender laws, has prepared many honest men for changes in government, which otherwise they would not have thought of. . . .

While the radical defects in the proposed system are not so soon discovered, some temptations to each state, and to many classes of men to adopt it, are very visible. It uses the democratic language of several of the state constitutions, particularly that of Massachusetts; the eastern states will receive advantages so far as the regulation of trade, by a bare majority, is committed to it: Connecticut and New Jersey will receive their share of a general impost: The middle states will receive the advantages surrounding the seat of government; The southern states will receive protection, and have their negroes represented in the legislature, and large back countries will soon have a majority in it. This system promises a large field of employment to military gentlemen, and gentlemen of the law; and in case the government shall be executed without convulsions, it will afford security to creditors, to the clergy, salary-men and others depending on money payments. . . .

. . . This subject of consolidating the states is new: and because forty or fifty men have agreed in a system, to suppose the good sense of this country, an enlightened nation, must adopt it without examination, and though in a state of profound peace, without endeavouring to amend those parts they perceive are defective, dangerous to freedom, and destructive of the valuable principles of republican government—is truly humiliating. It is true there may be danger in delay; but there is danger in adopting the system in its present form; and I see the danger in either case will arise principally from the conduct and views of two very unprincipled parties in the United States—two fires, between which the honest and substantial people have long found themselves situated. One party is composed of little insurgents, men in debt, who want no law, and who want a share of the property of others; these are called

levellers, Shayites, &c. The other party is composed of a few, but more dangerous men, with their servile dependents; these avariciously grasp at all power and property; you may discover in all the actions of these men, an evident dislike to free and equal government, and they will go systematically to work to change, essentially, the forms of government in this country; these are called aristocrats, m—ites, &c. &c. Between these two parties is the weight of the community; the men of middling property, men not in debt on the one hand, and men, on the other, content with republican governments, and not aiming at immense fortunes, offices, and power. In 1786, the little insurgents, the levellers, came forth, invaded the rights of others, and attempted to establish governments according to their wills. Their movements evidently gave encouragement to the other party, which, in 1787, has taken the political field, and with its fashionable dependants, and the tongue and the pen, is endeavoring to establish in a great haste, a politer kind of government. These two parties, which will probably be opposed or united as it may suit their interests and views, are really insignificant, compared with the solid, free, and independent part of the community. It is not my intention to suggest, that either of these parties, and the real friends of the proposed constitution, are the same men. The fact is, these aristocrats support and hasten the adoption of the proposed constitution, merely because they think it is a stepping stone to their favorite object.

7. Party Alignments in Massachusetts. During the winter of 1787–88, public attention shifted from state to state as one by one the various state conventions met to ratify or reject the Constitution. When the Massachusetts Convention met, Henry Knox of that state wrote to George Washington, January 14, 1788, to describe the political situation.²³

The Massachusetts Convention were to meet on the 9th. The decision of Connecticut will influence in a degree their determination and I have no doubt that the Constitution will be adopted in Massachusetts—But it is at this moment questionable whether it will be by a large majority

There are three parties existing in that state at present, differing in their numbers and greatly differing in their wealth and talents

The 1st is the commercial part of the state to which are added all the men of considerable property. The clergy,—the Lawyers—including all the judges of all the courts, and all the officers of the late army, and also the neighbourhood of all the great Towns—its numbers may include 3/7th

of the State. This party are for the most vigorous government perhaps many of them would have been still more pleased with the new Constitution had it been more analagous to the british Constitution

The 2d party are the eastern part of the state lying beyond New Hampshir formerly the Province of Main—This party are cheifly looking towards the erection of a new state and the Ma-

jority of them will adopt or reject the New Constitution as it may facilitate or retard their designs, without regarding the merits of the great question—This party 2/7ths

The 3d party are the Insurgents, or their favorers, the great majority of whom are for an annihilation of debts public & private, and therefore they will not approve the new constitution—This party 2/7ths

C.

THE NATURE OF THE UNION

In any attempt to assess the value of the work done at Philadelphia in 1787 one must recognize, first, the sharp limitations which public opinion placed upon any effort to create an effective union and, second, the extreme difficulty of the objectives which the Convention sought to attain.

From any study of the records the fact emerges that the American people were not prepared for a clear-cut national union in 1787, or, indeed, for some decades thereafter. Confronted with a choice between state and nation, they would unhesitatingly have chosen the state. Therefore, the only means of advancing the cause of nationalism lay in harmonizing it with the continued integrity of the states, or, as Oliver Ellsworth expressed it, "The only chance we have to support a general government is to graft it on the state governments." To state this in another way, an ambiguous nationalism was the only kind that stood any chance of acceptance, and the Constitutional arrangement allowed for just such ambiguity, in that it created two separate spheres of political activity, making the state supreme in one, the central organization in the other. This was ideal for those who did not wish to choose between state and nation and hence ideal for a period when American nationalism stood at a stage of incomplete development. But however nicely the functions of state and nation might be balanced, an unresolved question remained: In the event of a Constitutional clash between state authority and central authority, where did the decision lie? In case of a dispute between state and central governments, each claiming to act within its assigned sphere, which would determine the issue and which would have to give way? And for the individual, in the event of such a clash, where did the ultimate loyalty reside? This involves the whole question as to why the citizen owes obedience to his government at all, why the government can exercise a special form of authority known as sovereignty.

The supporters of the Constitution of 1787 preferred not to deal with this question. For nearly a decade the question was not even raised. For a generation it did not receive close analytical study. And not until the Civil War did each American have to give his own fateful answer. It is logical, therefore, to defer the problem of the final authority of government until somewhat later in this series. But while observing the refining discrimination with which the Constitution distributed the powers of government between those concurrent authorities—the union and the states—the student may wish to remember that it could not, for all its skillful balance, divide the right to demand the ultimate loyalty of the citizen. In this sense the republic paid heavily in the 1860s for the ambiguity which had been so necessary seventy years before.

Turning from the limits which necessity forced upon the Convention to the achievements which it set for itself, one finds that the framers attempted two political feats of extreme difficulty. One of these was to reconcile the principle of collective strength with that of local self-government; the other was to reconcile the principle of popular or majority rule with that of personal liberty and minority rights.

The ideas of the framers themselves as to this first objective are illustrated in the first selection below. In a more general sense the measure of the success of this effort to harmonize national strength with local freedom is to be found in the fact that at its inception the Constitution won the support of some of the most jealous defenders of the integrity of the states, while in more recent times it has sanctioned the growth of the highest degree of national power; that it has afforded a degree of collective strength adequate for the prosecution of World Wars I and II, but at the same time has continued to foster

the community self-reliance and local initiative which are essential to a healthy democracy. This does not mean, of course, that the states play in the twentieth century the part which was assigned to them in the eighteenth, but it remains true that the solution of 1787 has permitted the constant interplay of central and local authority, the one increasing, the other diminishing, as the times might require.

The ideas of the framers as to majority rule and minority rights is illustrated in the second selection. Here one does well to recall that, although the American political creed places great emphasis upon majority rule, Americans have never believed in the right of the majority to do whatever it pleases. No majority, however large, has sanction under the American system to deny the freedom of speech of the individual or to imprison a person without judicial process or to require conformity to any given religion or to confiscate the property of the individual without just compensation. If unrestricted majority rule—that is, unrestricted democracy—is not accepted even today, it was far less so in the eighteenth century, when democracy was largely an untried experiment and, in so far as it had been tried, was associated with factionalism, mob rule, and chronic disorder. Yet sensitive as the framers were to these dangers, they sincerely desired to maintain the principle of government by the consent of the governed just as it had been postulated in the Declaration of Independence.

In setting up these balanced relationships between central and local authority and between the majority and the individual, the Convention reconciled not only opposing principles of government but also opposing interest groups. In the first case, advocates of the Virginia and New Jersey Plans were brought into agreement, not only by the basis of representation in the House and in the Senate but also by the entire intricate arrangement for making the system “partly federal and partly national.” In the second case, radical democrats were appeased by the system of direct popular election of representatives, while conservatives were reassured by the prohibitions which were placed on the states (bills of credit and stay laws) and by the indirect process of choosing President, Senators, and judicial officers. In this sense the selections below constitute sequels to the contests indicated in sections A and B.

1. *Federal and National.* In Number 39 of the *Federalist*, James Madison sought to explain the new relationship that was being created between central and local government. The relationship is usually described today as “federal,” and the term has won general acceptance. In the eighteenth century, however, a federal system meant one in which a number of completely integral units were joined in a loose association or league; the central organization acted only on the member governments but did not act on individual citizens (e.g., the United Nations can ask the government of the United States for money or troops but it cannot tax or conscript American citizens). By contrast there also existed another universally known type of government—the national unit—which fused or consolidated all member parts into a single, solid state, possessing complete authority within its own limits and enjoying an unlimited control over the citizen.

The Constitution, as Madison sought to explain, does not conform to either of these patterns, but partakes of both.²⁴

“But it was not sufficient,” say the adversaries of the proposed Constitution, “for the convention to adhere to the republican form. They ought,

with equal care, to have preserved the FEDERAL form, which regards the Union as a CONFEDERACY of sovereign states; instead of which, they have framed a NATIONAL government, which regards the Union as a CONSOLIDATION of the States.” And it is asked by what authority this bold and radical innovation was undertaken? The handle which has been made of this objection requires that it should be examined with some precision.

. . . In order to ascertain the real character of the government, it may be considered in relation to the foundation on which it is to be established; to the sources from which its ordinary powers are to be drawn; to the operation of those powers; to the extent of them; and to the authority by which future changes in the government are to be introduced.

On examining the first relation, it appears, on one hand, that the Constitution is to be founded on the assent and ratification of the people of America, given by deputies elected for the special purpose; but, on the other, that this assent and ratification is to be given by the people, not as individuals composing one entire nation, but as composing the distinct and independent States to which they respectively belong. It is to be the assent and ratification of the several States, derived from the supreme authority in each State,—

the authority of the people themselves. The act, therefore, establishing the Constitution, will not be a NATIONAL, but a FEDERAL act.

That it will be a federal and not a national act, as these terms are understood by the objectors; the act of the people, as forming so many independent States, not as forming one aggregate nation, is obvious from this single consideration, that it is to result neither from the decision of a MAJORITY of the people of the Union, nor from that of a MAJORITY of the States. It must result from the UNANIMOUS assent of the several States that are parties to it, differing no otherwise from their ordinary assent than in its being expressed, not by the legislative authority, but by that of the people themselves. Were the people regarded in this transaction as forming one nation, the will of the majority of the whole people of the United States would bind the minority, in the same manner as the majority in each State must bind the minority; and the will of the majority must be determined either by a comparison of the individual votes, or by considering the will of the majority of the States as evidence of the will of a majority of the people of the United States. Neither of these rules have been adopted. Each State, in ratifying the Constitution, is considered as a sovereign body, independent of all others, and only to be bound by its own voluntary act. In this relation, then, the new Constitution will, if established, be a FEDERAL, and not a NATIONAL constitution.

The next relation is, to the sources from which the ordinary powers of government are to be derived. The House of Representatives will derive its powers from the people of America; and the people will be represented in the same proportion, and on the same principle, as they are in the legislature of a particular State. So far the government is NATIONAL, not FEDERAL. The Senate, on the other hand, will derive its powers from the States, as political and coequal societies; and these will be represented on the principle of equality in the Senate, as they now are in the existing Congress. So far the government is FEDERAL, not NATIONAL. The executive power will be derived from a very compound source. The immediate election of the President is to be made by the States in their political characters. The votes allotted to them are in a compound ratio, which considers them partly as distinct and coequal societies, partly as unequal members of the same society. The eventual election, again, is to be made by that branch of the legislature which consists of the national representatives; but in this particular act they are to be thrown into the form of individual delegations, from so many distinct and coequal bodies politic. From this aspect of the government it appears to be of a mixed character.

presenting at least as many FEDERAL as NATIONAL features.

The difference between a federal and national government, as it relates to the OPERATION OF THE GOVERNMENT, is supposed to consist in this, that in the former the powers operate on the political bodies composing the Confederacy, in their political capacities; in the latter, on the individual citizens composing the nation, in their individual capacities. On trying the Constitution by this criterion, it falls under the NATIONAL, not the FEDERAL character; though perhaps not so completely as has been understood. In several cases, and particularly in the trial of controversies to which States may be parties, they must be viewed and proceeded against in their collective and political capacities only. So far the national countenance of the government on this side seems to be disfigured by a few federal features. But this blemish is perhaps unavoidable in any plan; and the operation of the government on the people, in their individual capacities, in its ordinary and most essential proceedings, may, on the whole, designate it, in this relation, a NATIONAL government.

But if the government be national with regard to the OPERATION of its powers, it changes its aspect again when we contemplate it in relation to the EXTENT of its powers. The idea of a national government involves in it, not only an authority over the individual citizens, but an indefinite supremacy over all persons and things, so far as they are objects of lawful government. Among a people, consolidated into one nation, this supremacy is completely vested in the national legislature. Among communities united for particular purposes, it is vested partly in the general and partly in the municipal legislatures. In the former case, all local authorities are subordinate to the supreme; and may be controlled, directed, or abolished by it at pleasure. In the latter, the local or municipal authorities form distinct and independent portions of the supremacy, no more subject, within their respective spheres, to the general authority, than the general authority is subject to them, within its own sphere. In this relation, then, the proposed government cannot be deemed a NATIONAL one; since its jurisdiction extends to certain enumerated objects only, and leaves to the several States a residuary and inviolable sovereignty over all other objects. . . .

If we try the Constitution by its last relation to the authority by which amendments are to be made, we find it neither wholly NATIONAL nor wholly FEDERAL. Were it wholly national, the supreme and ultimate authority would reside in the MAJORITY of the people of the Union; and this authority would be competent at all times, like that of a majority of every national society,

to alter or abolish its established government. Were it wholly federal, on the other hand, the concurrence of each State in the Union would be essential to every alteration that would be binding on all. The mode provided by the plan of the convention is not founded on either of these principles. In requiring more than a majority, and particularly in computing the proportion by STATES, not by CITIZENS, it departs from the NATIONAL and advances towards the FEDERAL character; in rendering the concurrence of less than the whole number of States sufficient, it loses again the FEDERAL and partakes of the NATIONAL character.

The proposed Constitution, therefore, is, in strictness, neither a national nor a federal Constitution, but a composition of both. In its foundation it is federal, not national; in the sources from which the ordinary powers of the government are drawn, it is partly federal and partly national; in the operation of these powers, it is national, not federal; in the extent of them, again, it is federal, not national; and, finally, in the authoritative mode of introducing amendments, it is neither wholly federal nor wholly national.

2. *Majority Rule and Minority Rights.* Although the American Republic is based upon democratic ideals and follows democratic practices, the Constitution was apparently intended to set up a limited rather than an unlimited democracy. This was true, first of all, in the basic sense that the whole purpose of a written constitution (is to place limits upon what the government, i.e., the agent of the majority, may do.) In so far as democracy means the unrestricted power of the majority, even the Bill of Rights is undemocratic. It was true in the further sense that only one branch of the government—the House of Representatives—was to be chosen by direct popular election, while other branches—the Executive, the Senate, the Judiciary—were to be chosen indirectly. It was true, finally, in that the terms of Representatives, Senators, and the President were all of varying span, so that, being upon different cycles, these officials could not all be displaced from office in a single popular election.

Many of the framers, in fact, were fearful of a democratic experiment, and though James Madison was not one of this number, he explained, in Number 10 of *The Federalist*, why and how the Constitution was devised to make the will of the majority effective without enabling it to victimize those who were in the minority. This essay is perhaps the most philosophical and profound of all the *Federalist* papers.²⁵

Among the numerous advantages promised by a well-constructed Union, none deserves to be more accurately developed than its (tendency to break and control the violence of faction) . . . Complaints are everywhere heard from our most considerate and virtuous citizens, equally the friends of public and private faith, and of public and personal liberty, that our governments are too unstable, that the public good is disregarded in the conflicts of rival parties, and that measures are too often decided, not according to the rules of justice and the rights of the minor party, but by the superior force of an interested and overbearing majority. . . .

By a faction, I understand a number of citizens, whether amounting to a majority or minority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion, or of interest, adverse to the rights of other citizens, or to the permanent and aggregate interests of the community.

There are two methods of curing the mischiefs of faction: the one, by removing its causes; the other, by controlling its effects.

There are again two methods of removing the causes of faction: the one, by destroying the liberty which is essential to its existence; the other, by giving to every citizen the same opinions, the same passions, and the same interests.

It could never be more truly said than of the first remedy, that it was worse than the disease. Liberty is to faction what air is to fire, an aliment without which it instantly expires. But it could not be less folly to abolish liberty, which is essential to political life, because it nourishes faction, than it would be to wish the annihilation of air, which is essential to animal life, because it imparts to fire its destructive agency.

The second expedient is as impracticable as the first would be unwise. As long as the reason of man continues fallible, and he is at liberty to exercise it, different opinions will be formed. As long as the connection subsists between his reason and his self-love, his opinions and his passions will have a reciprocal influence on each other; and the former will be objects to which the latter will attach themselves. The diversity in the faculties of men, from which the rights of property originate, is not less an insuperable obstacle to a uniformity of interests. The protection of these faculties is the first object of government. From the protection of different and unequal faculties of acquiring property, the possession of different degrees and kinds of property immediately results; and from the influence of these on the sentiments and views of the respective proprietors, ensues a division of the society into different interests and parties. . . .

. . . But the most common and durable source

of factions has been the various and unequal distribution of property. Those who hold and those who are without property have ever formed distinct interests in society. Those who are creditors, and those who are debtors, fall under a like discrimination. A landed interest, a manufacturing interest, a mercantile interest, a moneyed interest, with many lesser interests, grow up of necessity in civilised nations, and divide them into different classes, actuated by different sentiments and views. The regulation of these various and interfering interests forms the principal task of modern legislation, and involves the spirit of party and faction in the necessary and ordinary operations of the government.

No man is allowed to be a judge in his own cause, because his interest would certainly bias his judgment, and, not improbably, corrupt his integrity. With equal, nay, with greater reason, a body of men are unfit to be both judges and parties at the same time; yet what are many of the most important acts of legislation but so many judicial determinations, not indeed concerning the rights of single persons, but concerning the rights of large bodies of citizens? And what are the different classes of legislators but advocates and parties to the causes which they determine? Is a law proposed concerning private debts? It is a question to which the creditors are parties on one side and the debtors on the other. Justice ought to hold the balance between them. Yet the parties are, and must be, themselves the judges; and the most numerous party, or, in other words, the most powerful faction must be expected to prevail. Shall domestic manufactures be encouraged, and in what degree, by restrictions on foreign manufactures? are questions which would be differently decided by the landed and the manufacturing classes, and probably by neither with a sole regard to justice and the public good. The apportionment of taxes on the various descriptions of property is an act which seems to require the most exact impartiality; yet there is, perhaps, no legislative act in which greater opportunity and temptation are given to a predominant party to trample on the rules of justice. Every shilling with which they overburden the inferior number is a shilling saved to their own pockets. . . .

The inference to which we are brought is, that the *causes* of faction cannot be removed, and that relief is only to be sought in the means of controlling its *effects*.

If a faction consists of less than a majority, relief is supplied by the republican principle, which enables the majority to defeat its sinister views by regular vote. It may clog the administration, it may convulse the society; but it will be unable to execute and mask its violence under the forms of the Constitution. When a majority is included in

a faction, the form of popular government, on the other hand, enables it to sacrifice to its ruling passion or interest both the public good and the rights of other citizens. To secure the public good and private rights against the danger of such a faction, and at the same time to preserve the spirit and the form of popular government, is then the great object to which our inquiries are directed. . . .

By what means is this object obtainable? Evidently by one of two only. Either the existence of the same passion or interest in a majority at the same time must be prevented, or the majority, having such co-existent passion or interest, must be rendered, by their number and local situation, unable to concert and carry into effect schemes of oppression. If the impulse and the opportunity be suffered to coincide, we well know that neither moral nor religious motives can be relied on as an adequate control. . . .

From this view of the subject it may be concluded that a pure democracy, by which I mean a society consisting of a small number of citizens, who assemble and administer the government in person, can admit of no cure for the mischiefs of faction. A common passion or interest will, in almost every case, be felt by a majority of the whole; a communication and concert result from the form of government itself; and there is nothing to check the inducements to sacrifice the weaker party or an obnoxious individual. Hence it is that such democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths. . . .

A republic, by which I mean a government in which the scheme of representation takes place, opens a different prospect, and promises the cure for which we are seeking. Let us examine the points in which it varies from pure democracy, and we shall comprehend both the nature of the cure and the efficacy which it must derive from the Union.

The two great points of difference between a democracy and a republic are: first, the delegation of the government, in the latter, to a small number of citizens elected by the rest; secondly, the greater number of citizens, and greater sphere of country, over which the latter may be extended.

The effect of the first difference is, on the one hand, to refine and enlarge the public views, by passing them through the medium of a chosen body of citizens, whose wisdom may best discern the true interest of their country, and whose patriotism and love of justice will be least likely to sacrifice it to temporary or partial considerations. Under such a regulation, it may well hap-

pen that the public voice, pronounced by the representatives of the people, will be more consonant to the public good than if pronounced by the people themselves, convened for the purpose. On the other hand, the effect may be inverted. Men of factious tempers, of local prejudices, or of sinister designs, may, by intrigue, by corruption, or by other means, first obtain the suffrages, and then betray the interests, of the people. The question resulting is, whether small or extensive republics are more favourable to the election of proper guardians of the public weal; and it is clearly decided in favour of the latter by two obvious considerations:

In the first place, it is to be remarked that, however small the republic may be, the representatives must be raised to a certain number, in order to guard against the cabals of a few; and that, however large it may be, they must be limited to a certain number, in order to guard against the confusion of a multitude. Hence the number of representatives in the two cases not being in proportion to that of the two constituents, and being proportionally greater in the small republic, it follows that, if the proportion of fit characters be not less in the large than in the small republic, the former will present a greater option, and consequently a greater probability of a fit choice.

In the next place, as each representative will be chosen by a greater number of citizens in the large than in the small republic, it will be more difficult for unworthy candidates to practise with success the vicious arts by which elections are too often carried; and the suffrages of the people being more free, will be more likely to centre in men who possess the most attractive merit and the most diffusive and established character. . . .

The other point of difference is, the greater number of citizens and extent of territory which may be brought within the compass of republican than of democratic government; and it is this circumstance principally which renders factious combinations less to be dreaded in the former than in the latter. The smaller the society, the fewer probably will be the distinct parties and interests composing it; the fewer the distinct parties and interests, the more frequently will a majority be

found of the same party; and the smaller the number of individuals composing a majority, and the smaller the compass within which they are placed, the more easily will they concert and execute their plans of oppression. Extend the sphere, and you take in a greater variety of parties and interests; you make it less probable that a majority of the whole will have a common motive to invade the rights of other citizens; or if such a common motive exists, it will be more difficult for all who feel it to discover their own strength, and to act in unison with each other. . . .

Hence, it clearly appears, that the same advantage which a republic has over a democracy, in controlling the effects of faction, is enjoyed by a large over a small republic—is enjoyed by the Union over the States composing it. Does the advantage consist in the substitution of representatives whose enlightened views and virtuous sentiments render them superior to local prejudices and to schemes of injustice? It will not be denied that the representation of the Union will be most likely to possess these requisite endowments. Does it consist in the greater security afforded by a greater variety of parties, against the event of any one party being able to outnumber and oppress the rest? In an equal degree does the increased variety of parties comprised within the Union increase this security. . . .

The influence of factious leaders may kindle a flame within their particular States, but will be unable to spread a general conflagration through the other States. A religious sect may degenerate into a political faction in a part of the Confederacy; but the variety of sects dispersed over the entire face of it must secure the national councils against any danger from that source. A rage for paper money, for an abolition of debts, for an equal division of property, or for any other improper or wicked project, will be less apt to pervade the whole body of the Union than a particular member of it; in the same proportion as such a malady is more likely to taint a particular county or district, than an entire State.

In the extent and proper structure of the Union, therefore, we behold a republican remedy for the diseases most incident to republican government.

III

Nationalism and Sectionalism

AN attentive examination of what is going on in the United States will easily convince us that two opposite tendencies exist in that country, like two distinct currents flowing in contrary directions in the same channel. The Union has now existed for forty-five years, and in the course of that time a vast number of provincial prejudices which were at first hostile to its power, have died away. The patriotic feeling which attached each of the Americans to his own native state is becoming less exclusive, and the different parts of the Union have become more intimately connected the better they have become acquainted with each other. . . . Nevertheless a careful examination of the history of the United States for the last forty-five years will readily convince us that the Federal power is declining.

ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE

CONTENTS

Questions for Study	66
Historical Background	67
Part I: The Force of Nationalism	68
Part II: The Force of Sectionalism	83

QUESTIONS FOR STUDY

1. The statements of both Henry Adams and Edward Gibbon Wakefield provide a sequel to the predictions of Josiah Tucker in Problem I (p. 23). To what extent do they indicate that Tucker's expectations were being realized?
2. What was the number of natives living in the thirteen original states in 1850? What was the number of inhabitants living in states which had been created by the United States government? In what states did the number of immigrants from abroad and from other states exceed the number of natives? What effect would such population movements have upon sectionalism and nationalism?
3. It is sometimes said that America remained in a state of economic colonialism for many years after the attainment of political independence. According to the selections from Calhoun and Callender (Part I, Section B) what was happening to this colonialism between the War of 1812 and the middle of the century?
4. It may be argued that Jefferson's philosophy potentially strengthened nationalism by placing it on a popular basis but, in another sense, weakened it by minimizing the sphere of government action. Explain.
5. John Quincy Adams, Andrew Jackson, and Robert F. Stockton all believed that national power should promote human welfare, yet each applied the idea differently. Explain.
6. Comparing nationalism as discussed by Kohn with sectionalism as discussed by Turner, would you say that they are intrinsically two different things or the same thing at different levels? Do the attributes of nationalism correspond with those of sectionalism?
7. According to Turner, the doctrine of states' rights is deceptive in that it is never seriously invoked to defend the state as a state. Explain.
8. How does Royce's definition of sectionalism (p. 87) compare with the definitions of nationalism previously studied?
9. In the period immediately following the Revolution a strong sectional dualism between North and South was recognized, but slavery was not regarded as a primary feature of this dualism. Explain, using the selections from James Madison, Patrick Henry, and John Tyler.
10. Sometimes the antagonism between rival sections takes the form of a contest over measures that would confer economic benefit unevenly, sometimes it is simply a struggle for power or control in the government. How do the contests shown in the selections from Jefferson, Giles, and Plumer (Part II, Section B) illustrate both of these forms?
11. Although Miss Martineau emphasizes "Sectional Prejudice," her discussion shows that certain conditions will always evoke a strong nationalistic reaction in an American. Explain.
12. Is the statement by Alexander Stephens wholly sectional, wholly national, or mixed? Point out the phrases that justify your opinion.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Throughout the world no country showed such striking outward evidences of national growth and national self-consciousness as did the United States during the first half of the nineteenth century. None increased so rapidly in population as did this country with its 4,000,000 people in 1790 and its 31,000,000 seventy years later. None gained so extensively in area as the young republic which skirted the Atlantic Coast in the time of Washington and stood firmly planted on the shores of the Pacific in the time of Lincoln. To foreign travelers no people seemed culturally more uniform, more standardized in character, than the Americans with their optimism, their driving energy, their "go-getter" fondness for accumulating dollars, their strict morality, and their faith in education, democracy, and progress. Certainly the Americans were confident and proud—even boastful—of their free republican institutions, compared with which they regarded all other governments as decadent. One American who lived during this period later observed: "We were taught every day and in every way that ours was the freest, the happiest, and soon to be the greatest and most powerful country in the world."

Yet one of the greatest stimulants to nationalism was at the same time an impediment. This was the immense extent of the country. Americans proudly compared the area of their republic with the less spacious dimensions of the European powers, and as they did so they thrilled with national pride. But increased extent means increased diversity of climate, of topography, of resources, and therefore of economy and social organization. Diversity not infrequently means conflicting interests, and conflicting interests may mean political strife along geographical lines. Such regional conflict—usually termed sectionalism—running counter to nationalism, showed itself repeatedly during the same period when nationalism was making its most significant strides. At the time of the War of 1812 New England displayed an emphatic sectional unwillingness to share in the prosecution of the war. In 1820 the nation split into hostile camps, dividing almost wholly on sectional lines in connection with the admission of Missouri to statehood. This conflict was quickly patched up, but the abruptness and fierceness with which it had broken out provided an alarming proof of the unstable factors in American nationalism. Again, in the 1830s, South Carolina's attempt to nullify the operation of a federal law showed the gravity of the sectional threat to the American union. Later events, of course, were to jeopardize the union even more seriously, and it was finally preserved only by four years of civil war which imposed upon eleven states in the South a government that, at least for a time, lacked the consent of the governed.

In this parallelism of the antagonistic forces of nationalism and sectionalism, the United States presented developments that were in the most extreme degree paradoxical, and Problem III is concerned with aspects of the paradox. What were the factors contributing to the progress of nationalism during this period of its rapid growth? What were some of the proofs that national feeling was advancing to a far more highly developed point than it had reached during the Revolutionary period? By contrast, what was sectionalism? Treating this as a counterpart of nationalism, we may well approach it as we did nationalism by an authoritative analysis of the subject in general. For this purpose, Frederick Jackson Turner's essay on sectionalism serves to present the concept. After observing the characteristics and general qualities of sectionalism, we may then turn, both in this Problem and in later ones, to the interplay of national and sectional forces, which, as de Tocqueville remarked, seemed "like two distinct currents flowing in contrary directions in the same channel."

THE PROBLEM

Part I.

THE FORCE OF NATIONALISM

The War of Independence had stimulated the growth of American national feeling, and the framing of the Constitution had provided a political system within which such feeling could be fostered and conserved. These developments have been the topics of Problems I and II. It remained to be seen, however, whether the loyalties born in the midst of war would persist in times of peace. Certainly peace is the true testing time of nationalism, and the United States experienced long intervals of peace between 1787 and 1861. Two wars—the conflict with England in 1812 and with Mexico in 1846—interrupted this peace, but the United States remained profoundly civilian in its attitudes throughout the whole period. The memory of the Revolution, with Washington as its hero and the Fourth of July as its commemorative day, contributed more to sustain the national spirit than did all the warfare from Yorktown until Gettysburg. Jackson's victory at New Orleans, Perry's on Lake Erie, Taylor's at Buena Vista, and Scott's at Mexico City—all served to strengthen American nationalism, but essentially nationalism faced the challenge that it must advance under conditions of peace or not at all.

The primary challenge to nationalism during this time was the challenge of American diversity. Western Europe, an area smaller than the United States, had produced almost a dozen national units. The physical conditions there seemed no more varied than those in America. Most of the previous experience of the human race, therefore, seemed to suggest that the potential American nation would probably disintegrate into a number of smaller and more homogeneous parts. Yet most Americans showed resolute confidence in the destiny of their American union. Clearly this physical tendency toward disintegration and the emotional will to maintain union were in conflict with each other. A question arises, therefore, as to how strong the physical tendency was. If it was very strong, why did it not cause the break-up toward which it tended? If it did not thus assert itself, what prevented it from doing so? Was the loyalty and vision of Americans broader than that of Europeans, or were other factors at work?

A.

BARRIERS TO CLOSER UNION

In Problem I, we read the prediction of Josiah Tucker, Dean of Gloucester, that Americans were destined to be "a disunited people till the end of time," because of their dissimilarities in customs, religion, and attitudes and even more because of the effect of great rivers, mountains, and arms of the sea in separating them. Tucker's analysis can be judged on its own merits, but he did not develop it. And as a loyal subject of George III, he was, perhaps, susceptible to prejudice. The opinion of others, therefore, may well be examined for light on the expected effect of America's geographical extent and diversity.

1. *Henry Adams on America, 1800.* One of the most valuable descriptions of conditions in the early period of the republic is to be found in Henry Adams' *History of the United States during the Administrations of Jefferson and Madison*. In the first chapter of this work, which is recognized as one of the great contributions to American historical literature, Adams describes America in 1800, its geography, and the extent to which geography constituted a barrier to union.¹

With the exception that half a million people had crossed the Alleghanies and were struggling

with difficulties all their own, in an isolation like that of Jutes or Angles in the fifth century, America, so far as concerned physical problems, had changed little in fifty years. The old landmarks remained nearly where they stood before. The same bad roads and difficult rivers, connecting the same small towns, stretched into the same forests in 1800 as when the armies of Braddock and Amherst pierced the western and northern wilderness, except that these roads extended a few miles farther from the seacoast. Nature was rather man's master than his servant, and the five million Americans struggling with the untamed continent seemed hardly more competent

to their task than the beavers and buffalo which had for countless generations made bridges and roads of their own.

Even by water, along the seaboard, communication was as slow and almost as irregular as in colonial times. The wars in Europe caused a sudden and great increase in American shipping employed in foreign commerce, without yet leading to general improvement in navigation. The ordinary sea-going vessel carried a freight of about two hundred and fifty tons; the largest merchant ships hardly reached four hundred tons; the largest frigate in the United States navy, the "line-of-battle ship in disguise," had a capacity of fifteen hundred and seventy-six tons. Elaborately rigged as ships or brigs, the small merchant craft required large crews and were slow sailers; but the voyage to Europe was comparatively more comfortable and more regular than the voyage from New York to Albany, or through Long Island Sound to Providence. No regular packet plied between New York and Albany. Passengers waited till a sloop was advertised to sail; they provided their own bedding and supplies; and within the nineteenth century Captain Elias Bunker won much fame by building the sloop "Experiment," of one hundred and ten tons, to start regularly on a fixed day for Albany, for the convenience of passengers only, supplying beds, wine, and provisions for the voyage of one hundred and fifty miles. A week on the North River or on the Sound was an experience not at all unknown to travellers.

While little improvement had been made in water-travel, every increase of distance added to the difficulties of the westward journey. The settler who after buying wagon and horses hauled his family and goods across the mountains, might buy or build a broad flat-bottomed ark, to float with him and his fortunes down the Ohio, in constant peril of upsetting or being sunk; but only light boats with strong oars could mount the stream, or boats forced against the current by laboriously poling in shallow water. If he carried his tobacco and wheat down the Mississippi to the Spanish port of New Orleans, and sold it, he might return to his home in Kentucky or Ohio by a long and dangerous journey on horseback through the Indian country from Natchez to Nashville, or he might take ship to Philadelphia, if a ship were about to sail, and again cross the Alleghanies. Compared with river travel, the sea was commonly an easy and safe highway. Nearly all the rivers which penetrated the interior were unsure, liable to be made dangerous by freshets, and both dangerous and impassable by drought; yet such as they were, these streams made the main paths of traffic. Through the mountainous gorges of the Susquehanna the produce of west-

ern New York first found an outlet; the Cuyahoga and Muskingum were the first highway from the Lakes to the Ohio; the Ohio itself, with its great tributaries the Cumberland and the Tennessee, marked the lines of western migration; and every stream which could at high water float a boat was thought likely to become a path for commerce. As General Washington, not twenty years earlier, hoped that the brawling waters of the Cheat and Youghiogheny might become the channel of trade between Chesapeake Bay and Pittsburg, so the Americans of 1800 were prepared to risk life and property on any streamlet that fell foaming down either flank of the Alleghanies. The experience of mankind proved trade to be dependent on water communications, and as yet Americans did not dream that the experience of mankind was useless to them.

If America was to be developed along the lines of water communication alone, by such means as were known to Europe, Nature had decided that the experiment of a single republican government must meet extreme difficulties. The valley of the Ohio had no more to do with that of the Hudson, the Susquehanna, the Potomac, the Roanoke, and the Santee, than the valley of the Danube with that of the Rhone, the Po, or the Elbe. Close communication by land could alone hold the great geographical divisions together either in interest or in fear. The union of New England with New York and Pennsylvania was not an easy task even as a problem of geography, and with an ocean highway; but the union of New England with the Carolinas, and of the seacoast with the interior, promised to be a hopeless undertaking. Physical contact alone could make one country of these isolated empires, but to the patriotic American of 1800, struggling for the continued existence of an embryo nation, with machinery so inadequate, the idea of ever bringing the Mississippi River, either by land or water, into close contact with New England, must have seemed wild.

2. *Size and Unity.* When Adams wrote his description of the United States as of the year 1800, he had the perspective of almost a century. But copious evidence makes clear that Americans at the time were very doubtful how large an area the union could occupy without breaking under its own weight. In 1803, when the republic was doubled in extent by the Louisiana Purchase, Fisher Ames, the Federalist leader, lamented: "The Mississippi was a boundary. . . . We were confined within some limits. Now, by adding unmeasured worlds beyond that river we rush like a comet into infinite space." Taken by itself this might seem the mere partisan spirit of

opposition expressing itself, but, in fact, Jefferson himself showed considerable uncertainty as to what the Purchase would mean for the future of the union. He seriously considered a Constitutional Amendment to prevent migration into the unsettled parts of the region. Writing to his friend John C. Breckinridge as to the destiny of the region, he said: "The future inhabitants of the Atlantic and Mississippi [*sic*] states will be our sons. We leave them in distinct but bordering establishments. We think we see their happiness in their union, & we wish it. Events may prove it otherwise; and if they see their interest in separation why should we take sides with our Atlantic rather than our Mississippi [*sic*] descendants. . . . God bless them both & keep them in union if it be for their good, but separate them if it be better."

In 1819, Major Stephen Long made a report to the government on an exploring expedition which he had led across the High Plains and into the Rocky Mountains. In this account of his discoveries, he declared that a great area east of the Rockies formed a desert and would be forever unfit for settlement, but, instead of regarding this condition as wholly regrettable, he added the observation that it might, in some ways, "prove of infinite importance to the United States, inasmuch as it is calculated to serve as a barrier to prevent too great an extension of our population westward." American anxiety about westward expansion is more understandable in the light of some population factors which were discussed in 1834 by Edward Gibbon Wakefield, the colonizer of New Zealand.²

In the history of the world, there is no example of a society at once dispersed and highly civilized; while there are instances without end, in the history of colonization, of societies which, being civilized, became barbarous as soon as they were dispersed over an extensive territory. That division of each man's labour among several employments, which, says Adam Smith, is the immediate cause of ignorance, is an effect of dispersion; and dispersion interferes with the cultivation of knowledge in another way; that is, by obstacles to social

intercourse, to the interchange of ideas, to the exercise of the mental faculties.

The citizens of the United States are a more dispersed society than the colonists of Franklin's time. When Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, the vast regions west of the Alleghenies had scarcely been opened for settlement. Washington became a soldier in contests with the Indians on the western frontier of Virginia, which is now the eastern frontier of states more extensive than the dependent colonies. Even if the increase of people had been equal to the acquisition of land, still the dispersion would have been greater, because the interior settlements are, by reason of their great distance from the sea, more deficient in natural means of communication. Washington often foretold some of the evils that would result from spreading towards the west, unless the eastern and western states were connected by canals and good roads. His warning was neglected until lately, when the eastern states became alarmed at the amount of emigration to the west. In those eastern states, the dependent colonies that were, they talk now of Washington's inspiration, and are most anxious to establish means of intercourse with the western settlements: they will find it difficult to remedy their own error. The western wilderness was theirs, and liable to be treated in the way most for their advantage. They thought only of gratifying their national vanity, by extending as much as possible the surface of the Union. Not content with promoting emigration to the wilderness, when their own population was so scanty that they ought rather to have encouraged immigration from Europe, they sent to Europe for the purpose of acquiring more wilderness, and in one case [the Louisiana Purchase] actually paid hard money for an accession of mischief. The result is, that population has spread, not merely as fast as it has increased, but faster; that there are fewer people to the square mile than when population was about a quarter of its present amount; and that this smaller number of people in proportion to land, besides being separated from each other by greater distance, are not so well provided with the means of social intercourse. Where there are markets, there the people live together; but these are few and far between. . . .

B.

THE CEMENT OF UNION

If it is true that a wide dispersion of people tends to weaken nationalism, the American spirit of nationality ought to have declined as the American population between 1800 and 1850 scattered over an immense area. Not only were both sides of the Mississippi valley settled, but there was even enough population on the Pacific coast by the 1850s to warrant the admission of Oregon and California as states. The people in this new region found that mountain barriers isolated them so completely from the eastern states that the 20,000 mile trip around Cape Horn seemed the best way of going from one part of their republic

to another. Yet as the population dispersed, the bonds of union seemed actually to gain in strength; as the distances included within the territory of the republic increased, the people seemed actually to grow closer together. The selections that follow are varied, relating to population, to commerce, to transportation and to political policy, but all have in common the fact that they throw light on the factors which enabled, or even caused, the people of the United States to grow psychically closer while they were growing physically more distant from one another.

1. *Interstate Migration.* In 1850 the United States census for the first time collected information on the birthplace of all persons living in the United States. From this information it was possible to take the total population of any state and to show the number who were born in that state, the number whose birthplace was in some other state, and the number whose birthplace was outside the United States. The student should analyze

these figures with an eye to the question how such migration of peoples influenced loyalties to state and nation and how the loyalties of the migratory citizen may have differed from those of a person who was native to the state of his residence. These figures are also of interest for what they show as to the population of the older states which had created the union, and as to the population of new states which had been created by the union.³

	Population born in state	Population born in other states	Population born outside United States	Total
Maine	514,655	35,019	31,695	581,813
New Hampshire	258,132	44,925	14,257	317,456
Vermont	228,489	50,894	33,688	313,402
Massachusetts	679,624	139,419	163,598	985,450
Rhode Island	98,754	21,221	23,832	143,875
Connecticut	284,978	39,117	38,374	383,099
New York	2,092,076	296,754	655,224	3,048,325
New Jersey	361,691	43,711	59,804	465,509
Pennsylvania	1,787,310	165,966	303,105	2,258,160
Delaware	55,591	10,326	5,243	71,169
Maryland	326,040	40,610	51,011	417,943
District of Columbia	18,875	14,620	4,913	37,941
Virginia	813,891	57,502	22,953	894,800
North Carolina	529,483	20,784	2,565	553,028
South Carolina	253,399	12,601	8,508	274,563
Georgia	394,979	119,587	6,452	521,572
Florida	19,120	25,322	2,740	47,203
Alabama	234,691	183,324	7,498	426,514
Mississippi	135,501	154,946	4,782	295,718
Louisiana	126,917	60,641	67,308	255,491
Texas	43,281	92,657	17,620	154,034
Arkansas	60,996	98,950	1,408	162,189
Tennessee	580,695	168,966	5,638	756,836
Kentucky	580,129	148,582	31,401	761,413
Missouri	265,304	249,223	76,570	592,004
Illinois	331,089	399,733	111,860	846,034
Indiana	520,583	398,695	55,537	977,154
Ohio	1,203,490	529,208	218,099	1,955,050
Michigan	137,637	201,586	54,593	395,071
Wisconsin	54,312	139,166	110,471	304,756
Iowa	41,305	129,294	20,968	191,881
California	7,696	61,866	21,629	91,635
Minnesota Territory	1,572	2,486	1,977	6,038
New Mexico Territory	58,404	761	2,151	61,525
Oregon Territory	2,301	9,636	959	13,087
Utah Territory	1,159	8,117	2,044	11,330
Total	13,103,650	4,176,225	2,240,535	19,553,068

2. *The Attitude of the West.* One of the developments which was most certain to change the pattern of American nationalism, either strengthening it or weakening it, was the growing importance after 1800 of the West, of western states, and of western citizens. The table just examined indicates the origins and size in 1850 of the American population in the western areas. By that time more than two thirds of the area of the country consisted of land that had been acquired since the formation of the republic, and more than one third of the inhabitants lived in areas that had not been settled at all at the time of the first census in 1790. It is important to know what attitude these new areas had toward the central government. A very brief but suggestive answer was offered by Frances Wright D'Arusmont, better known in American history as Fanny Wright, among other things the founder of an experimental colony for ex-slaves at Nashoba, Tennessee. She first visited America in 1818-20 and recorded her impressions in a series of letters which were later published as *Views of Society and Manners in America*.⁴

But the quarter of the Republic to which the eye of a stranger turns with most curiosity, is the vast region to the west of the Alleghenies. The character of these republics is necessarily as unique as their position, and their influence is already powerful upon the floor of congress.

In glancing at their geographical position, the foreigner might hastily be led to consider them as growing rivals rather than friendly supporters of the Atlantic states. It will be found, however, that they are at present powerful cementers of the union, and that the feelings and interests are such as to draw together the north and south divisions of the confederacy.

The new canals will probably draw off the produce of the western counties of New York to the Atlantic; still, however, a portion will find its way down the western waters, as their navigation shall be perfected from Erie to New Orleans. At all events, this route will continue to be preferred by the western [*sic*] counties of Pennsylvania, shortly destined to be the seat, if they are not so already, of flourishing manufactures.

The reviving ascendancy of the manufacturing over the commercial interest creates a strong community of feeling between the northern and western sections of the Union. Pittsburg, the young Manchester of the United States, must always have the character of a western city, and its maritime port be New Orleans. Corinth was not more truly the eye of Greece than is Pittsburg of America. Pennsylvania, in which it stands, uniting

perfectly the characters of an Atlantic and a western state, is truly the *key-stone of the federal arch*.

But if the new states are thus linked with the north, they have also some feelings in common with the south, and thus, drawing two ways, seem to consolidate that confederacy which Europeans have sometimes prophesied they would break. In the first place, Kentucky and Tennessee, the oldest members of this young family, have not only been peopled from Virginia and the Carolinas, but originally made part of those states. Generously released from their jurisdiction, they still retain a marked affection for their parents; and have, too, a community of evil with them, as well as of origin, in the form of black slavery. It is not unlikely, that the mixture of slave-holding and non-slave-holding states to the west of the Alleghenies, helps to balance the interests between the northern and southern sections of the Union on the floor of congress.

It is plain that in the course of a few generations, the most populous and powerful division of the American family will be watered by the Mississippi, not the Atlantic. From the character of their infancy we may prophesy, that the growing preponderance of the western republics will redound to the national honor, and will draw more closely the social league, which binds together the great American family.

Bred up under the eye, and fostered by the care of the federal government, they have attached themselves to the national institutions with a devotion of feeling unknown in the older parts of the Republic.

3. *The New Transportation and Communication.* A vital factor in American growth in the first half of the nineteenth century was the revolution in transportation and communication which occurred during that period. To secure a brief but comprehensive account of these developments, the editors have prepared the following selection.

Although the United States in the period from 1800 to 1860 witnessed sweeping changes in almost every aspect of life, probably nothing had a more revolutionary effect upon the conditions of living than the new methods of transportation and communication which came into operation during these decades. At the beginning of the century the principal routes of travel were waterways, created by nature, or occasional roads few in number and wretched in condition. The only sources of power for the movement of conveyances were the force of wind applied to the sails of vessels, the downward flow of streams, and the muscle of living creatures—pack animals, horses or other draft animals harnessed to wagons, and

men with poles on river boats. With such limitations upon routes and upon the power available for locomotion, travel was slow and roundabout, and the movement of goods was prohibitively expensive. Goods could be loaded on flatboats and floated downstream in considerable volume, but the difficulties of upstream navigation were so great that not one tenth so much freight was sent upstream on the Mississippi River system as went down. Very often the men who guided the flatboats downstream to New Orleans would return on foot all the way to the point from which they had departed, or would at least walk along the old Natchez trace, across what are now the states of Mississippi and Tennessee, until they reached the Tennessee or Cumberland Rivers, which flow northward into the Ohio. At that time the cost of sending goods overland was about \$10 per ton per hundred miles, and in many cases it was higher. For instance, to move goods from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh cost \$160 a ton as late as 1817, and from New York to Buffalo \$100 a ton at about the same time. Only items with very high value in proportion to their bulk could pay such rates, and commodities such as grain could not be produced for sale in distant markets. For many interior districts this meant that there was no incentive to settle because there was no commercial incentive to produce.

One by one all these conditions were revolutionized. First, better *routes* of travel began to develop. As early as 1794 the building of an excellent hard-surfaced road from Lancaster, Pennsylvania, to Philadelphia inaugurated an era of turnpike construction in all the states. New York alone built 1400 miles of turnpikes by 1811; Pennsylvania, 2200 miles by 1832. In 1806 Congress voted federal funds for a road to the West, and in 1818 this National Pike or Cumberland Road was completed from Cumberland, Maryland, to Wheeling, in what is now West Virginia, on the Ohio River. This road was later extended to a distance of 834 miles, with its terminus at Jefferson City, Missouri. As such highways were completed, transportation costs fell perhaps as much as one third but were still too high for the movement of most agricultural products. Even better routes were needed, and, with the Atlantic seaboard cities competing intensely for leadership, the country turned from turnpikes to canals.

The greatest of the early canals was, of course, the Erie, completed in 1825, extending 363 miles from Buffalo to Albany and providing a water link between the Great Lakes and New York harbor. This canal, and later ones, greatly reduced costs of shipping and travel. Goods now paid only \$5 a ton from New York to Buffalo, one twentieth of the former charge, and Horace Greeley wrote, with some exaggeration, that he traveled on the

Erie Canal for a cent and a half a mile, a mile and a half an hour. Other states were quick to follow the example set by New York, and by 1850 the canal mileage in the United States totaled 3698.

These improvements in route, however, served primarily to connect natural waterways. (The first great objective of the Cumberland Road was to link the ports of Baltimore and Philadelphia with the river port of Wheeling, while the Erie Canal was a link between the Hudson River and the Great Lakes system.) They did not furnish sources of power more efficient than wind, current, and muscle. The solution to this problem was the application of steam power, first on water then on land.

Americans had attempted to apply steam to navigation long before Robert Fulton began to experiment. While the Constitutional Convention was in session at Philadelphia in 1787, many of the members went to see the steamboat which John Fitch had devised and which was operating on regular schedule from Philadelphia to Burlington, New Jersey. But Fitch later could not duplicate this uniquely successful craft, and it was not until 1807 that Robert Fulton succeeded in introducing regular steam navigation on the Hudson River. Even then it developed that Fulton's type of vessel with its deep draft and limited power could not cope with the sandbars and swift currents of the Mississippi, and it was not until 1816 that Henry Shreve built the first effective river boat. His success marked the beginning of a new era, and within forty years river traffic assumed vast proportions. By 1860 there were approximately one thousand steamboats in operation on the Mississippi River system, and the commerce of New Orleans had grown from \$5,000,000 in 1807 to \$185,000,000. The finest of the river boats, over 360 feet in length, were almost as large as the best ocean liners of the same period, and their speed was such that they could set a record of 3 days, 23 hours, 9 minutes from New Orleans to St. Louis—an average rate of more than 13 miles per hour upstream.

The steamboat made America's splendid network of waterways more useful commercially than ever before, but it could not release economic growth from confinement to the areas nature had endowed with navigable waters. Accessibility to interior points remained to be furnished by the steam railroad. The growth of railroads began in the 1830s. On July 4, 1828, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, last surviving signer of the Declaration of Independence, laid the first stone for the track of the Baltimore and Ohio. In South Carolina in 1833 the Charleston and Hamburg completed its 136 mile road, which was at that time the longest in the world. Its locomotive achieved a speed of thirty miles per hour when running

alone, or from sixteen to twenty-one miles per hour when drawing four loaded cars. After a brief experimental phase, the railroad was recognized as the logical successor to the turnpike and the canal; the enthusiasm for this new means of transportation led to the building of 30,000 miles of railroad by 1860. The railroads in many cases reduced the distances of travel, for steel rails were more direct than meandering streams: the river distance from Cincinnati to St. Louis, for instance, was 720 miles, while the distance by railroad was 327 miles. Also, there was a widespread and drastic reduction in freight rates: by 1848 the average rate per ton per hundred miles was \$8.97 for first-class freight and \$6.16 for second-class.

Thus, steam revolutionized transportation. At the same time electricity was revolutionizing communication. In June 1844 Samuel F. B. Morse sent the first long-distance telegraphic message in America from Baltimore to Washington over a line which Congress had voted \$30,000 to help him build. Sixteen years later there were 50,000 miles of telegraph line in operation, and by 1861 the telegraph had been extended to the Pacific coast. The telegraph carried news instantly from one point to another, but it did not distribute its message to a large public.

This supplementary function of mass dissemination of news was performed by a new type of daily paper. There had been no inexpensive dailies in the country before 1833, when Benjamin H. Day began to issue the first penny paper, the *New York Sun*; but the 1840s and 1850s witnessed an enormous growth of newspaper publication. In 1860 there were almost 400 dailies and even more numerous weekly, bi-weekly, and monthly papers; it is estimated that 10,000,000 copies were printed that year. Most of these journals were local, but a few enjoyed general circulation: the weekly edition of the *New York Tribune* was estimated by 1860 to reach more than 10 percent of the voting population in eight states, and more than 5 percent in eleven others.

Another major factor in the development of communications was the rapid growth of the postal system. In the sixty-eight years from 1791 to 1859 post offices increased from 89 to 27,977. Rates for a two-page letter going more than 500 miles decreased from 50 cents to 5 cents, and the number of service miles covered in transporting the mails rose from 846,468 to 86,308,402. These improvements were, of course, linked with the general growth of better transportation, but they also illustrate the way in which technological improvements were used to increase the flow of communication as well as goods among the various parts of the union.

4. *The New Commerce.* A transportation system has significance only in terms of what it transports. The American transportation system, measured by this criterion, became vitally important because it carried an internal commerce of steadily growing weight. Until 1831 American foreign trade had always exceeded internal trade, but in that year the tonnage of the internal trade for the first time exceeded the tonnage of imports and exports. By 1847 the Secretary of the Treasury could estimate that American production had reached an annual value of \$3,000,000,000, that of this amount only \$150,000,000 worth was exported, while interstate trade ran to a value of \$500,000,000. Other analysts placed the value of the internal trade as high as \$1,450,000,000. Whatever figures are correct, it is clear that exchange of goods within the United States had become a major feature of the American economy. The character of this commerce is well described by Guy S. Callender in an account which begins by observing that, until about 1800, American farmers produced very little which they were able to use as a money crop, and therefore lived largely on a basis of producing their own necessities, with the result that there was but little commerce.⁵

The influence which rapidly changed all this was the introduction of cotton culture into the South and its extension after 1815 over the southwest. About the same time, also, there was a considerable extension of sugar culture in Louisiana, and tobacco culture in Kentucky and Tennessee. Here was a group of commodities almost as much in demand everywhere as the precious metals themselves, and having large value in small bulk so that they were able to bear the expense of land transportation for long distances over the poor roads of new settlements. The soil and climate of a vast region were peculiarly suited to the production of cotton, the demand for which was increasing at a prodigious rate. This region was covered by a network of navigable streams that could easily and cheaply float this valuable product to tide water. The timely application of steam power to navigation perfected a natural transportation system entirely adequate for a community devoted to producing a few such commodities and exchanging them with the outside world.

The effect of these economic advantages was not confined to the South. Very soon they were felt by every other section of the country. The great profit to be secured in the cultivation of cotton and sugar caused the people of South Carolina

and the Gulf States to devote themselves chiefly to these industries and to neglect the other branches of agriculture. The gradual absorption of these industries by planters with slave labor increased this tendency, as the one advantage of that labor, viz., its capacity for being organized, could only be utilized in them. Mixed farming could not be profitably carried on by slaves in the South; hence the planters were glad to purchase their agricultural supplies, so far as possible, from other producers.

The live stock could be driven overland to the plantations, and the great network of rivers with their flatboats and steamboats provided an easy means of transportation for other supplies. All kinds of produce from such important products as pork, bacon, lard, beef, butter, cheese, corn, flour, and whiskey, to such little ones as apples, cider, vinegar, soap, and candles went down the Ohio and Mississippi in great quantities. This was the first important market which the farmers of Tennessee, Kentucky, and the northwest secured, and it wrought an improvement in their economic situation almost as remarkable as the introduction of cotton culture produced in the southwest.

The prosperity of the South and West now in turn influenced the East. The people of these sections were able for the first time to purchase freely from other communities. The commodities to satisfy their wants were partly imported from abroad, and partly produced in New England and the Middle States. Accordingly, both the commercial and manufacturing interests of this section were greatly stimulated. New York reached out with her Erie Canal to secure a larger share of the growing internal trade, and a keen rivalry sprang up among the commercial cities of the seaboard which has lasted to the present day. Manufactures also began now to feel the influence of that expanding home market which has played so great a part in their development ever since.

This account is sufficient to make clear the general character of internal commerce. Its basis was a territorial division of labor among the three great sections of the country resting upon foreign commerce. The South was able to devote itself chiefly to the production of a few staples, turning out a great surplus of them for export and depending upon the other two sections for much of its agricultural produce, nearly all of its manufactures, and to a large extent for the conduct of its commerce. Both its exports and imports were carried largely by northern shipping, went through northern ports, and was either actually in the hands of northern merchants or financed by northern capital. The northwest devoted itself chiefly to agriculture, depending at first entirely upon

the South for its markets, but gradually acquiring after 1840 a home market in the northeast and a foreign one in Europe. New England and the Middle States were devoted principally to commerce and manufactures by which they were enabled to supply the needs of the other two sections, depending at first upon their own farmers for their agricultural supplies and later drawing them partly from the southern seaboard slave states and partly from the northwest, especially from the region about the Great Lakes.

The great streams of commerce which resulted from this territorial division of labor were, first, the trade on the western rivers consisting principally of agricultural produce sent down the river to the planters—little southern produce was brought back except sugar and molasses from Louisiana; second, there was a large coasting trade, consisting of manufactures sent from northern to southern ports with return cargoes of southern staples for the supply of the northeastern states or for export, supplemented by some food supplies for New England; third, there was the trade of the seaboard cities with the West, made up for the most part of manufactures, imported and domestic, sent westward over the canals to the Ohio or the Lakes, and intended to supply the western farmers or to be forwarded down the rivers to the planters of the southwest.

5. *The Program of Economic Nationalism.*

The two preceding selections have suggested somewhat indirectly that economic conditions might have a profound effect upon the progress or the obstruction of nationalism. In these it is implied, for the most part correctly, that, in so far as economic change did affect nationalism, it was an unforeseen and "purely coincidental" development. By and large this is true. Nationalism was in no sense strong enough to establish the economic conditions which it needed for its own growth. But national spirit was at least aware of the possibilities created by engineering, invention, and technology, and it was prepared to avail itself of these possibilities. The conscious desire of nationalists to strengthen economic bonds is shown by a speech of John C. Calhoun of South Carolina in the House of Representatives on February 4, 1817. Later to become the great spokesman of states' rights, Calhoun was at that time an enthusiastic young nationalist. He was discussing a proposal to vote certain funds for the construction of roads and canals. The opposition had argued that such projects ought to be financed by private enterprise, and Calhoun was replying to this contention.⁶

But there are higher and more powerful considerations why Congress ought to take charge of this subject. If we were only to consider the pecuniary advantages of a good system of roads and canals, it might, indeed, admit of some doubt whether they ought not to be left wholly to individual exertions; but, when we come to consider how intimately the strength and political prosperity of the republic are connected with this subject, we find the most urgent reasons why we should apply our resources to them. In many respects, no country, of equal population and wealth, possesses equal materials of power with ours. The people, in muscular power, in hardy and enterprising habits, and in lofty and gallant courage, are surpassed by none. In one respect, and, in my opinion, in one only, are we materially weak. We occupy a surface prodigiously great in proportion to our numbers. The common strength is brought to bear with great difficulty on the point that may be menaced by an enemy. It is our duty, then, as far as in the nature of things it can be effected, to counteract this weakness. Good roads and canals, judiciously laid out, are the proper remedy. In the recent war, how much did we suffer for the want of them! Besides the tardiness and the consequential inefficacy of our military movements, to what an increased expense was the country put for the article of transportation alone! In the event of another war, the saving, in this particular, would go far towards indemnifying us for the expense of constructing the means of transportation.

But, on this subject of national power, what can be more important than a perfect unity in every part, in feelings and sentiments? And what can tend more powerfully to produce it than overcoming the effects of distance? No state, enjoying freedom, ever occupied any thing like as great an extent of country as this republic. One hundred years ago, the most profound philosophers did not believe it to be even possible. They did not suppose it possible that a pure republic could exist on as great a scale even as the island of Great Britain. What then was considered as chimerical, we now have the felicity to enjoy; and, what is more remarkable, such is the happy mould of our Government—so wisely are the State and General powers arranged—that much of our political happiness derives its origin from the extent of our republic. It has exempted us from most of the causes which distracted the small republics of antiquity. Let it not, however,

be forgotten; let it be for ever kept in mind, that it exposes us to the greatest of all calamities—next to the loss of liberty—and even to that in its consequence—disunion. We are great, and rapidly—I was about to say fearfully—growing. This is our pride and our danger; our weakness and our strength. Little does he deserve to be intrusted with the liberties of this people, who does not raise his mind to these truths. We are under the most imperious obligation to counteract every tendency to disunion. The strongest of all cements is, undoubtedly, the wisdom, justice, and above all, the moderation of this House; yet the great subject on which we are now deliberating, in this respect deserves the most serious consideration. Whatever impedes the intercourse of the extremes with this, the centre of the republic, weakens the union. The more enlarged the sphere of commercial circulation—the more extended that of social intercourse—the more strongly are we bound together—the more inseparable are our destinies. Those who understand the human heart best know how powerfully distance tends to break the sympathies of our nature. Nothing—not even dissimilarity of language—tends more to estrange man from man. Let us, then, bind the republic together with a perfect system of roads and canals. Let us conquer space. It is thus the most distant parts of the republic will be brought within a few days' travel of the centre; it is thus that a citizen of the West will read the news of Boston still moist from the press. The mail and the press are the nerves of the body politic. By them, the slightest impression made on the most remote parts, is communicated to the whole system; and the more perfect the means of transportation, the more rapid and true the vibration. To aid us in this great work—to maintain the integrity of this republic, we inhabit a country presenting the most admirable advantages. Belted around, as it is, by lakes and oceans—intersected in every direction by bays and rivers, the hand of industry and art is tempted to improvement. So situated, blessed with a form of government at once combining liberty and strength, we may reasonably raise our eyes to a most splendid future, if we only act in a manner worthy of our advantages. If, however, neglecting them, we permit a low, sordid, selfish and sectional spirit to take possession of this House, this happy scene will vanish. We will divide;—and in its consequences will follow, misery and despotism.

C.

DEMOCRACY AND NATIONALISM

As the economic links and social ties of union grew stronger and more numerous, they provided the basis for a more vigorous nationalism. At the same time, patriotic loyalties

gained in strength, and Americans began to treat the symbols of their union—the flag and the Constitution—as objects of veneration. Independence Day became an occasion for exercises of devotion to the republic; sentiments of loyalty were cultivated in the mind of every child; and travelers in the United States invariably encountered an unshakable belief in the superiority of American institutions.

The one great institution most certain to reflect these sentiments and to be strengthened by them was the central government. As Kohn remarks, nationalism aspires to a corporate form, and this form is the political state of which government is the essence. In its more fully developed form this concept of the state is linked with (1) the idea of control by the people (popular government), which Kohn regards as an indispensable prerequisite to nationalism, and with (2) the idea of creating an authority to protect society and safeguard the public interest.

Hence it followed that the American government would best attract or inspire nationalistic loyalties in proportion as it reflected democratic (or popular) wishes and as it operated for the advantage of the democratic rank and file of the citizens. This tendency so to do may be regarded in one sense as a measure of the degree to which nationalism already made itself felt in government, in another sense as a measure of the degree to which government fostered nationalism.

Resting as it did upon the principles of the Declaration of Independence, the American political system had seemed to combine the ideas of union and democracy in a way most favorable to nationalistic feeling. But during the period when Alexander Hamilton, as Secretary of the Treasury, dominated the financial policy of the republic, many felt that the central government was seeking the support of powerful economic groups and that it would seal its alliance with such groups by conducting the government in a way advantageous to them. If this policy, which began with plans for a permanent public debt, a Bank of the United States, and a protective tariff, had continued in effect, it would inevitably have caused the states rather than the central government to become the centers of democracy, and democratic sympathy might have been permanently alienated from the central government. This was in fact in process of happening when the proponents of democracy—Thomas Jefferson and his followers—began to stress a doctrine of states' rights as a means of restraining a central authority which they distrusted. This cleavage between democracy and central authority, if it had been long continued, would have seriously endangered the growth of nationalism.

In 1800 the Federalists, with their Hamiltonian policies, were replaced in the government by the Democratic Republican party of Thomas Jefferson. The victory of Jefferson clearly indicated that the central government would be more democratic, but the prospect of a heightened nationalism was less assured. Hostility to a strong central authority which conferred favors on influential groups had made the Jeffersonians suspicious of strong central authority as such, and to some degree it appeared that a democratic union would be a less nationalistic rather than (as Kohn's analysis would imply) a more nationalistic one.

Gradually, however, the causes of democracy and nationalism were fused. Jefferson himself invoked national power in its fullest extent for the purchase of Louisiana and for the imposition of the Embargo. His followers, both in his own Democratic Republican party and in the later Democratic party of Andrew Jackson, found that where people controlled government they need not cling to their traditional fear of governmental power. Hence there emerged a clearer recognition of the uses of national power and a more exalted sense of the greatness of the national destiny.

The documents in this section will show something of the interplay of democratic and nationalistic forces. At the level of action they will show the United States behaving increasingly more like a nation of people and less like an association of states. At the level of ideas they will show how the democratic concept sometimes suggested a limitation, sometimes an extension of national power, and how the concept of the government as a democratic instrument being used for the good of America, or even the good of mankind, gave a unique emotional value to the national idea.

1. *Jefferson's Ideal.* When Jefferson came to the Presidency in 1801, displacing the Federalists, he used his inaugural address to state

his views on the power of the central government, what responsibility it bore to the citizens, and how this responsibility could

best be fulfilled. In analyzing his statement, the student should consider in what sense Jefferson regarded the government as "strong"—did he mean that it was strong in the forces sustaining it or in its power of action and its control over the lives of the citizens? ⁷

All . . . will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will to be rightful must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal law must protect, and to violate would be oppression. . . . I know, indeed, that some honest men fear that a republican government can not be strong, that this Government is not strong enough; but would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a government which has so far kept us free and firm on the theoretic and visionary fear that this Government, the world's best hope, may by possibility want energy to preserve itself? I trust not. I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest Government on earth. I believe it the only one where every man, at the call of the law, would fly to the standard of the law, and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern. Sometimes it is said that man can not be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the forms of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question.

Let us, then, with courage and confidence pursue our own Federal and Republican principles, our attachment to union and representative government. Kindly separated by nature and a wide ocean from the exterminating havoc of one quarter of the globe; . . . possessing a chosen country, with room enough for our descendants to the thousandth and thousandth generation; entertaining a due sense of our equal right to the use of our own faculties, to the acquisitions of our own industry, to honor and confidence from our fellow-citizens, resulting not from birth, but from our actions and their sense of them; enlightened by a benign religion, professed, indeed, and practiced in various forms, yet all of them inculcating honesty, truth, temperance, gratitude, and the love of man; acknowledging and adoring an overruling Providence, which by all its dispensations proves that it delights in the happiness of man here and his greater happiness hereafter—with all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and a prosperous people? Still one thing more, fellow-citizens—a wise and frugal Government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum

of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities.

About to enter, fellow-citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our Government, and consequently those which ought to shape its Administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations. Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none; the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican tendencies; the preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a jealous care of the right of election by the people—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority, the vital principle of republics, from which is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; a well-disciplined militia, our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war, till regulars may relieve them; the supremacy of the civil over the military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burthened; the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information and arraignment of all abuses at the bar of the public reason; freedom of religion; freedom of the press, and freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus, and trial by juries impartially selected. These principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith, the text of civic instruction, the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust. . . .

2. *Nationalism in the Judiciary.* Although the Federalists lost control of the Presidency and of Congress in 1801, they had appointed Chief Justice John Marshall, who dominated the Supreme Court for thirty-four years. Marshall used his position to affirm repeatedly the principle that the central government was a national government. As a defender of propertied interests he played down the dem-

ocratic factor in nationalism, but by his intellectual force and power he made one branch of the government an advocate of the concept of national authority at a time when the other two branches were more inclined to emphasize national limitations than national strength. Marshall's decision in the case of *Cohens v. Virginia* (1821) was perhaps the most striking of his many able affirmations of national power.⁸

The American States, as well as the American people, have believed a close and firm union to be essential to their liberty and to their happiness. They have been taught by experience that this union cannot exist without a government for the whole; and they have been taught by the same experience that this government would be a mere shadow, that must disappoint all their hopes, unless invested with large portions of that sovereignty which belongs to independent States. Under the influence of this opinion, and thus instructed by experience, the American people, in the conventions of their respective States, adopted the present constitution.

If it could be doubted, whether, from its nature, it were not supreme in all cases where it is empowered to act, that doubt would be removed by the declaration, that "this constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." This is the authoritative language of the American people; and, if gentlemen please, of the American States. It marks, with lines too strong to be mistaken, the characteristic distinction between the government of the Union, and those of the States. The general government, though limited as to its objects, is supreme with respect to those objects. This principle is a part of the constitution; and if there be any who deny its necessity, none can deny its authority.

To this supreme government ample powers are confided: and if it were possible to doubt the great purposes for which they were so confided, the people of the United States have declared, that they are given "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity." With the ample powers confided to this supreme government for these interesting purposes are connected many express and important limitations on the sovereignty of the States, which are made

for the same purposes. The powers of the Union, on the great subjects of war, peace and commerce, and on many others, are in themselves limitations of the sovereignty of the States; but in addition to these, the sovereignty of the States is surrendered in many instances where the surrender can only operate to the benefit of the people, and where, perhaps, no other power is conferred on Congress than a conservative power to maintain the principles established in the constitution. . . .

That the United States form, for many and for most important purposes, a single nation, has not yet been denied. In war we are one people. In making peace we are one people. In all commercial regulations we are one and the same people. In many other respects the American people are one, and the government which is alone capable of controlling and managing their interests in all these respects, is the government of the Union. It is their government, and in that character they have no other. America has chosen to be, in many respects, and to many purposes, a nation; and for all these purposes her government is complete; to all these objects it is competent. The people have declared that in the exercise of all the powers given for these objects it is supreme. It can, then, in effecting these objects, legitimately control all individuals or governments within the American territory. The constitution and laws of a State, so far as they are repugnant to the constitution and laws of the United States, are absolutely void. These States are constituent parts of the United States. They are members of one great empire—for some purposes sovereign, for some purposes subordinate.

3. *Nationalism in Foreign Policy: The Monroe Doctrine.* At the time when Marshall delivered his opinion in *Cohens v. Virginia*, the President of the United States was James Monroe. In his domestic policy Monroe maintained the Virginia doctrine of states' rights, and he vetoed appropriations for a national transportation system on the grounds of constitutionality. In foreign policy, however, he enunciated in the Doctrine which bears his name a vigorously national position. At a time when the Latin American republics had but recently established their independence and a monarchical combination in Europe was known to be entertaining plans for the forcible restoration of Spanish rule, Monroe announced the position of the United States on European intervention in the Western hemisphere. His statement was markedly nationalistic both in the powerful role that it proclaimed for the American government and in the distinctive values that it asserted for the American political ideal.⁹

In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are of necessity more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective Governments; and to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole nation is devoted. We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

4. *The Nation as Guardian of the Public Welfare: J. Q. Adams.* As Kohn suggests, the matured sense of nationalism "recognizes the nationality as the source of all creative cultural energy and of economic well-being." Inasmuch as this implies the culture and the prosperity of the whole body of citizens, it is an eminently democratic factor in the national concept. Jefferson, as an exponent of democracy, had given some support to this idea that the national government should act to safeguard the cultural and economic welfare of the American people, but his distrust of the Hamiltonian ideas of concentrated governmental power had led him to emphasize the negative rather than the positive functions of the central authority. His successors, however, while holding the same basic philosophy, began to apply it in a much more positive sense. This is shown by the policy of John Quincy Adams as President. In 1825 he stated in his first message to Congress what

he believed the responsibilities of the American government ought to be.¹⁰

Upon this first occasion of addressing the Legislature of the Union, with which I have been honored, in presenting to their view the execution so far as it has been effected of the measures sanctioned by them for promoting the internal improvement of our country, I can not close the communication without recommending to their calm and persevering consideration the general principle in a more enlarged extent. The great object of the institution of civil government is the improvement of the condition of those who are parties to the social compact, and no government, in whatever form constituted, can accomplish the lawful ends of its institution but in proportion as it improves the condition of those over whom it is established. Roads and canals, by multiplying and facilitating the communications and intercourse between distant regions and multitudes of men, are among the most important means of improvement. But moral, political, intellectual improvement are duties assigned by the Author of Our Existence to social no less than to individual man. For the fulfillment of those duties governments are invested with power, and to the attainment of the end—the progressive improvement of the condition of the governed—the exercise of delegated powers is a duty as sacred and indispensable as the usurpation of powers not granted is criminal and odious. Among the first, perhaps the very first, instrument for the improvement of the condition of men is knowledge, and to the acquisition of much of the knowledge adapted to the wants, the comforts, and enjoyments of human life public institutions and seminaries of learning are essential. . . .

In assuming her station among the civilized nations of the earth it would seem that our country had contracted the engagement to contribute her share of mind, of labor, and of expense to the improvement of those parts of knowledge which lie beyond the reach of individual acquisition, and particularly to geographical and astronomical science. Looking back to the history only of the half century since the declaration of our independence, and observing the generous emulation with which the Governments of France, Great Britain, and Russia have devoted the genius, the intelligence, the treasures of their respective nations to the common improvement of the species in these branches of science, is it not incumbent upon us to inquire whether we are not bound by obligations of a high and honorable character to contribute our portion of energy and exertion to the common stock? . . .

Connected with the establishment of an uni-

versity, or separate from it, might be undertaken the erection of an astronomical observatory, with provision for the support of an astronomer, to be in constant attendance of observation upon the phenomena of the heavens, and for the periodical publication of his observations. It is with no feeling of pride as an American that the remark may be made that on the comparatively small territorial surface of Europe there are existing upward of 130 of these light-houses of the skies, while throughout the whole American hemisphere there is not one. . . .

. . . if these powers and others enumerated in the Constitution may be effectually brought into action by laws promoting the improvement of agriculture, commerce, and manufactures, the cultivation and encouragement of the mechanic and of the elegant arts, the advancement of literature, and the progress of the sciences, ornamental and profound, to refrain from exercising them for the benefit of the people themselves would be to hide in the earth the talent committed to our charge—would be treachery to the most sacred of trusts.

The spirit of improvement is abroad upon the earth. It stimulates the hearts and sharpens the faculties not of our fellow-citizens alone, but of the nations of Europe and of their rulers. While dwelling with pleasing satisfaction upon the superior excellence of our political institutions, let us not be unmindful that liberty is power; that the nation blessed with the largest portion of liberty must in proportion to its numbers be the most powerful nation upon earth, and that the tenure of power by man is, in the moral purposes of his Creator, upon condition that it shall be exercised to ends of beneficence, to improve the condition of himself and his fellow-men. While foreign nations less blessed with that freedom which is power than ourselves are advancing with gigantic strides in the career of public improvement, were we to slumber in indolence or fold up our arms and proclaim to the world that we are palsied by the will of our constituents, would it not be to cast away the bounties of Providence and doom ourselves to perpetual inferiority? In the course of the year now drawing to its close we have beheld, under the auspices and at the expense of one State of this Union, a new university unfolding its portals to the sons of science and holding up the torch of human improvement to eyes that seek the light. We have seen under the persevering and enlightened enterprise of another State the waters of our Western lakes mingle with those of the ocean. If undertakings like these have been accomplished in the compass of a few years by the authority of single members of our Confederation, can we, the representative authorities of the whole Union, fall behind our

fellow-servants in the exercise of the trust committed to us for the benefit of our common sovereign by the accomplishment of works important to the whole and to which neither the authority nor the resources of any one State can be adequate?

5. *Reaffirmation of the Democratic Factor: Jackson.* It is almost an axiom that as the power of government is enlarged the potentiality of its abuse is increased. Conversely, its diminution reduces its capacity to promote the public welfare. But to the Jeffersonians the former hazard seemed more immediate than the latter. In maintaining a democratic nation it therefore becomes important frequently to reaffirm, if not the limits of governmental power, at least the true purposes for which it may legitimately be used. An occasion for such reaffirmation arose during the Presidency of Andrew Jackson. After the expiration of Hamilton's first Bank of the United States a second Bank had been chartered, and while Jackson was in the White House Congress voted to renew the charter. Jackson believed that the Bank, with its power of note issue and its influence over the financial system of the entire country, gave a privileged position and special advantages to a limited class of capitalists and currency manipulators. Accordingly, on July 10, 1832, he vetoed the recharter, and in doing so stated his beliefs as to the abuse and use of governmental powers. What does his philosophy contribute toward making democracy national and making nationalism democratic? ¹¹

It is to be regretted that the rich and powerful too often bend the acts of government to their selfish purposes. Distinctions in society will always exist under every just government. Equality of talents, of education, or of wealth can not be produced by human institutions. In the full enjoyment of the gifts of Heaven and the fruits of superior industry, economy, and virtue, every man is equally entitled to protection by law; but when the laws undertake to add to these natural and just advantages artificial distinctions, to grant titles, gratuities, and exclusive privileges, to make the rich richer and the potent more powerful, the humble members of society—the farmers, mechanics, and laborers—who have neither the time nor the means of securing like favors to themselves, have a right to complain of the injustice of their Government. There are no necessary evils in government. Its evils exist only in its abuses. If it would confine itself to equal protection, and, as Heaven does its rains, shower its favors alike on the high and the low, the rich and the poor, it

would be an unqualified blessing. In the act before me there seems to be a wide and unnecessary departure from these just principles.

Nor is our Government to be maintained or our Union preserved by invasions of the rights and powers of the several States. In thus attempting to make our General Government strong we make it weak. Its true strength consists in leaving individuals and States as much as possible to themselves—in making itself felt, not in its power, but in its beneficence; not in its control, but in its protection; not in binding the States more closely to the center, but leaving each to move unobstructed in its proper orbit.

Experience should teach us wisdom. Most of the difficulties our Government now encounters and most of the dangers which impend over our Union have sprung from an abandonment of the legitimate objects of Government by our national legislation, and the adoption of such principles as are embodied in this act. Many of our rich men have not been content with equal protection and equal benefits, but have besought us to make them richer by act of Congress. By attempting to gratify their desires we have in the results of our legislation arrayed section against section, interest against interest, and man against man, in a fearful commotion which threatens to shake the foundations of our Union. It is time to pause in our career to review our principles, and if possible revive that devoted patriotism and spirit of compromise which distinguished the sages of the Revolution and the fathers of our Union. If we can not at once, in justice to interests vested under improvident legislation, make our Government what it ought to be, we can at least take a stand against all new grants of monopolies and exclusive privileges, against any prostitution of our Government to the advancement of the few at the expense of the many, and in favor of compromise and gradual reform in our code of laws and system of political economy.

6. *Manifest Destiny*. Toward the middle of the nineteenth century republican self-confidence reached new heights, and Americans began to express their pride in their nation by the demand for territorial growth. They expressed their pride in their democratic institutions by the formulation of a doctrine that the extension of American freedom and American progress could "regenerate and disenthral" other countries throughout the world. Such sentiments of territorial and spiritual expansionism always appeared in time of war or international crisis. They were freely expressed in the War of 1812, but they reached their maximum with the Mexican War (1846). Here was a

contest which seemed to offer the acquisitions that would make the United States a continental republic and to offer an adversary that seemed to suffer acutely from the lack of the free institutions. In these conditions did not the United States have a "Manifest Destiny"? Many Americans were sure that it did, and one of these was Commodore Robert F. Stockton, who returned from conquests in California to address a public dinner at Philadelphia late in 1847.¹²

Annexation, nay acquisition, is not a necessary consequence of conquest—and, therefore, it is not on that account that I would offer my congratulations here to day—oh, no!

I care not for the beautiful fields and healthful skies of California. I care not for her leagues of land and her mines of silver. The glory of the achievements there—if any glory there be, is in the establishment of the first free press, in California—(Great applause)—in having built the first school house in California—in having established religious toleration as well as civil liberty in California—(Tremendous applause)—May the torch grow brighter and brighter, until from Cape Mendocino to Cape St. Lucas, it illumines the dark path of the victim of religious intolerance and political despotism. (Thunders of applause.) . . .

No thoughtful observer of the progress of the U. States, can fail to be impressed with the conviction that we enjoy a degree of happiness and prosperity never heretofore vouchsafed to the nations of mankind. With an unexampled measure of political liberty; unbroken social order; extraordinary growth of the arts and sciences—philanthropic and benevolent institutions, the fair offspring of the christian faith, extending their blessed agency, in all directions—unbounded religious toleration, heaven's best gift; for which our fathers risked and suffered most—with all these rich endowments, do we not indeed present an example of the beneficent care of Providence for which we can find no parallel in the history of man? . . .

But indemnity is not the object of the war. No man here or elsewhere will consent to weigh blood against money. [Great applause.] I do not care who presents the proposition—when it is presented; or to whom it is presented, whig or democrat; no man will weigh blood for money. (Loud applause.) But this is not, I repeat, our condition. Higher and nobler objects present themselves for the attainment of which you must increase your armies in Mexico, cost what it may. [Great applause.] Fifty thousand men must go to Mexico. [Renewed applause.]—Let me then state the objects for the attainment of which, in my judg-

ment, this augmentation of our force in Mexico, is required.

Mexico is poor and wretched. Why? Misgovernment—insatiable avarice—unintermitted wrong unsparing cruelty and unbending insolence—these have inflicted their curse on the unhappy country, and made her what she is. But as the darkest hour is that which just precedes the advent of the morning sun, so let us hope that a better and happier day is now about to dawn upon unfortunate Mexico. Be it ours, now to forgive her all her trespasses, and returning good for evil, make her free and happy!—[Enthusiastic applause which lasted several minutes.]

If I were now the sovereign authority, as I was once the viceroy—[laughter]—I would prosecute this war for the express purpose of redeeming Mexico from misrule and civil strife. . . . The priceless boon of civil and religious liberty has been confided to us as trustees—[cheers.]—I would

insist, if the war were to be prolonged for fifty years, and cost money enough to demand from us each year the half of all that we possess, I would still insist that the inestimable blessings of civil and religious liberty should be guaranteed to Mexico. We must not shrink from the solemn duty. We dare not shrink from it. We cannot lose sight of the great truth that nations are accountable as well as individuals, and that they too must meet the stern responsibilities of their moral character—they too must encounter the penalty of violated law in the more extended sphere adapted to their physical condition. . . .

We have vanquished Mexico. She is prostrate at our feet—we can afford to be magnanimous. Let us act so that we need not fear the strictest scrutiny of the christian and civilized world. I would with a magnanimous and kindly hand gather these wretched people within the fold of republicanism.

Part II.

THE FORCE OF SECTIONALISM

In preceding Problems and in the first part of this Problem, sectionalism has appeared frequently in explicit and implied form as a force antagonistic to nationalism. It has been presented principally, therefore, by contrast and, indirectly, as a foil to nationalism. Nationalism, on the other hand, has been examined with some degree of thoroughness as to what constitutes it, how it expressed itself politically, and what factors were operating to advance or retard it during the first half of the nineteenth century. Our analysis cannot proceed further without a similar investigation of the meaning and character of sectionalism. Accordingly, the remainder of Problem III deals with the meaning of sectionalism and with the relationship of sectionalism and nationalism in the period under consideration. In examining this curious relationship, it is well to bear in mind that nationalism and sectionalism are both forms of group-consciousness and that, as Kohn remarks, "group-consciousness is never exclusive." Later Problems will show something of the qualities which differentiated the sections in America, the public questions on which they clashed, and the political form in which sectionalism appeared. Thus the analysis of sectionalism will, in some degree, parallel the analysis of nationalism already given but will involve a greater degree of attention to the diverse political questions in which sectional division expressed itself.

A.

THE MEANING OF SECTIONALISM

The first American historian to deal with sectionalism in a broad and at the same time analytical way was Frederick Jackson Turner. One of the most influential figures in the writing of American history, Turner asked early in his career what made America and Americanism distinctive in world history. In origin, the American is merely a transplanted European, yet it is clear that he has developed until he has become a distinctive type with distinctive traits and attitudes. Turner, seeking the explanation of this distinctiveness, believed that he found it in the fact that every part of America has been, within the last three centuries, a frontier, and that the conditions of life on the frontier profoundly affected the inhabitants. This idea was set forth in a famous essay, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History."

Another aspect of distinctive Americanism, however, and one which cannot be ex-

plained simply in terms of the frontier, is the fact that American internal politics have been quite unlike those of the European countries. Clearly the nations of Europe, being smaller and more homogeneous, do not face the problem of rivalries between geographical areas within the national boundaries, or at least they do not face it on the same scale on which it appears in the United States. Turner's analysis of this factor led to another essay, "The Significance of the Section in American History." In the selections from this essay the student will find a convenient definition of a section, quoted from Josiah Royce, and he will also find an explanation not only of why sectionalism played a vital part in American history a century ago but also of why it always remains a force to be reckoned with and to be guarded against in the handling of American affairs.¹³

To the average American, to most American historians, and to most of the writers of our school textbooks (if one can trust the indexes to their books), the word *section* applies only to the struggle of South against North on the questions of slavery, state sovereignty, and, eventually, disunion.

But the Civil War was only the most drastic and most tragic of sectional manifestations, and in no small degree the form which it took depended upon the fact that rival societies, free and slave, were marching side by side into the unoccupied lands of the West, each attempting to dominate the back country, the hinterland, working out agreements from time to time, something like the diplomatic treaties of European nations, defining spheres of influence, and awarding mandates, such as in the Missouri Compromise, the Compromise of 1850, and the Kansas-Nebraska Act. Each Atlantic section was, in truth, engaged in a struggle for power; and power was to be gained by drawing upon the growing West. In the Virginia ratification convention of 1787 William Grayson, by no means the most radical of the members, said: "I look upon this as a contest for empire . . . If the Mississippi be shut up, emigrations will be stopped entirely. There will be no new states formed on the Western Waters . . . This contest of the Mississippi involves the great national contest; that is whether one part of this continent shall govern the other. The Northern States have the majority and will endeavor to retain it." Similar conceptions abound in the utterances of North Atlantic statesmen. "It has been said," declared Morris in 1787, "that North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia only, will in a little time have a majority of the people of America. They must in that case include the great interior country and everything is to be apprehended from their getting power into their hands."

If time permitted, it would be possible to illustrate by such utterances all through our history to very recent times how the Eastern sections regarded the West, with its advancing frontier, as the raw material for power. To New England, until her own children began to occupy the prairies ("reserved by God," as her pioneers declared, "for a pious and industrious people"), this aspect

of the West threatened to enable the South perpetually to rule the nation. The first great migration, the most extensive in the area covered, flowed into the interior from the Southern upland. . . .

Among the proposals of the Hartford Convention was that no new state should be admitted into the Union without the concurrence of two-thirds of both houses of Congress. Had this proposed amendment been made, the New England States with two other states in the Senate could have blocked the West from future statehood. The report warned the old states against "an overwhelming Western influence" and predicted that "finally the Western States, multiplied in numbers and augmented in population will control the interests of the whole." Nathan Dane, after whom Dane County in this state is named, furnished the argument for this proposed amendment by his elaborate tabulations and schedules. He pointed out that in the commercial states capital was invested in commerce, and in the slaveholding states in Western lands. When "Kentucky, Ohio and Tennessee were raised up by this interest & admitted into the Union, then the balance was, materially, affected. The non-commercial states pressed the admission of Louisiana and turned the balance against the Northeast." "It clearly follows," he reasoned, "that if a bare majority in Congress can admit new States into the union (all interior ones as they must be) at pleasure, in these immense Western regions, the balance of the union as once fairly contemplated, must soon be destroyed."

But Jackson defeated the British at New Orleans. The Mississippi Valley remained within the Union, Louisiana's interests became affiliated with the commercial states in many ways, and New England people poured so rapidly into the West that New England found in the northern half of the Valley the basis for a new alliance and new power as disturbing to the slave-holding South as the Southern and Western connection had been to New England.

By the middle of the century the South was alarmed at the Western power much in the way that New England had been. . . .

On the other hand, it must be clearly borne in

mind that as the West grew in power of population and in numbers of new senators, it resented the conception that it was merely an emanation from a rival North and South; that it was the dependency of one or another of the Eastern sections; that it was to be so limited and controlled as to maintain an equilibrium in the Senate between North and South. It took the attitude of a section itself.

Unlike such countries as France and Germany, the United States has the problem of the clash of economic interests closely associated with regional geography on a huge scale. Over areas equal to all France or to all Germany, either the agricultural or the manufacturing types are here in decided ascendancy. Economic interests are sectionalized. The sections occupied by a rural population are of course far inferior in numbers of voters to the sections of urban industrial life. The map is deceptive in this respect, for Greater New York City, which would be a point on the map, has almost as many people as live in all the vast spaces of the Mountain and Pacific States. The population of the New England States and the Middle States of the North Atlantic division is over thirty millions, while the combined population of Wisconsin, Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon is less than ten millions. On the map these states take an imposing space, but owing to physical geography a large portion will always remain sparsely settled. Nevertheless, New England and the Middle States together have only eighteen senators, while the states of the section which I have just named have also eighteen senators. New York State alone has a larger population than this northwestern zone of states; but this wealthy and populous state has only two senators as against the eighteen senators of the other region.

On a map constructed so as to give to each state a space proportioned to its population, or to its income tax, instead of to its dimensions in square miles, the Western lands would shrink in their map space in a startling fashion. But in the Senate is exhibited the outcome of the tendencies which statesmen like Gouverneur Morris saw so clearly—namely, the great power of the newer states by their equal representation in the Senate and their ability to take property by taxation from the wealthier section and to distribute it according to numbers, or even according to deficiencies, throughout the Union as a unit. Obviously, there is here the certainty of a sectional clash of interests not unlike those which led to Calhoun's South Carolina Exposition.

Sectionalism will hereafter be shaped by such new forces. We have become a nation comparable to all Europe in area, with settled geographic provinces which equal great European nations.

We are in this sense an empire, a federation of sections, a union of potential nations. It is well to look at the result of our leap to power since the ending of the frontier, in order to appreciate our problems arising from size and varied sections.

We raise three-fourths of the world's corn, over a third of its swine, over half its cotton, and over one-fifth its wheat. Out of the virgin wilderness we have built such industrial power that we now produce two-thirds of the pig iron of the world, over twice the steel tonnage of England, Germany, and France combined. We mine nearly half the world's coal. We have fully half the gold coin and bullion of the world, and in 1920 our national wealth exceeded the combined wealth of the United Kingdom, France, and Germany. In the World War President Wilson gave the word that sent two million Americans across the seas to turn the scale in that titanic conflict. We are forced to think of ourselves continentally and to compare ourselves with all Europe. Why, with so vast a territory, with so many geographic provinces, equal in area, in natural resources, and in natural variety to the lands of the great nations of Europe, did we not become another Europe? What tendencies have we developed that resembled those of Europe in the course of our history? Are there tendencies toward the transformation of our great sections into types similar to European nations?

It was evident at the outset of a study of the frontier movement that the American people were not passing into a monotonously uniform space. Rather, even in the colonial period, they were entering successive different geographic provinces; they were pouring their plastic pioneer life into geographic moulds. They would modify these moulds, they would have progressive revelations of the capacities of the geographic provinces which they won and settled and developed; but even the task of dealing constructively with the different regions would work its effects upon their traits.

Not a uniform surface, but a kind of checker-board of differing environments, lay before them in their settlement. There would be the interplay of the migrating stocks and the new geographic provinces. The outcome would be a combination of the two factors, land and people, the creation of differing societies in the different sections. European nations were discovered, conquered, colonized, and developed so far back in history that the process of nation-making is obscure. Not so with section-making in the United States. The process has gone on almost under our own observation. But by bondage to the modern map, as John Fiske put it, much American history has been obscured. Our constitutional forms, in contrast with the realities, provide for a federation of states.

Our historians have dealt chiefly with local history, state history, national history, and but little with sectional history. Our students of government have been more aware of the legal relations of states and nation than with the actual groupings of states into sections, and with the actions of these sections beneath the political surface. State sovereignty, for example, has in fact never been a vital issue except when a whole section stood behind the challenging state. This is what gave the protest reality. . . .

That sectionalism which is based on geographical regions has been in evidence from the early colonial period, but it has been obscured and modified by the influence of the unoccupied West. The states have been declining and are likely to continue to diminish in importance in our politics; but the groups of states called sections are likely to become more significant as the state declines. A study of votes in the federal House and Senate from the beginning of our national history reveals the fact that party voting has more often broken down than maintained itself, on fundamental issues; that when these votes are mapped or tabulated by the congressional districts or states from which those who cast them came, instead of by alphabetical arrangement, a persistent sectional pattern emerges.

There has been in the earlier periods the sharp clash between New England and the South, with the Middle States divided and unstable, constituting a buffer zone and often holding the balance of power. Then, as population spread westward, the greater parties were composed of sectional wings. Normally, in the Republican party there came to be a fairly solid conservative New England, a mixed and uncertain Middle Region, and a more radical North Central wing, ready in the shaping of legislation to join the Democrats in a kind of sectional *bloc* (even before the days of the *bloc*) to oppose the conservative and dominant Eastern wing. As time went on, the East North Central States came into closer connection with the Eastern wing, and in the West North Central lay the areas of radical dissent and of third-party movements. Legislation was determined less by party than by sectional voting. Bills were shaped for final passage by compromises between wings or by alliances between sections. The maps of presidential elections showing majorities by counties look like maps of North against South; but there was always a concealed East and West which temporarily laid aside their differences.

I think it not too much to say that in party conventions as well as in Congress the outcome of deliberations bears a striking resemblance to treaties between sections, suggestive of treaties between European nations in diplomatic congresses. But

over an area equal to all Europe we found it possible to legislate, and we tempered asperities and avoided wars by a process of sectional give-and-take. Whether we shall continue to preserve our national, our intersectional, party organization in the sharper sectional conflicts of interest that are likely to accompany the settling down of population, the completer revelation of the influence of physical geography, remains to be seen.

As an illustration of the newer forms of sectionalism, take the movement for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway. Middle Western leaders are arguing that there is "in the heart of the continent a large area beyond the radius of logical rail haul for the movement of bulk commodities to either seacoast." "Nature," runs the argument, "which has indicated the extent of the area which sends its surplus to the Atlantic seaboard and to the Gulf and to the Pacific ports, has provided the American continent with one potential seacoast not yet utilized. Upon the map of economic divides indicated by geography—the Atlantic seaboard, the Gulf territory, and the Pacific slope—there is, as it were, an economic desert a thousand miles east and west, five hundred miles north and south beyond the radius of logical rail haul to either coast." The desire to give an outlet to what is called this "landlocked commerce to the coast," leads to the demand for "a fourth economic divide based upon the Great Lakes as linked with the ocean, giving to the coast of the Great Lakes access to marine commerce" and permitting the erection of each rail system upon the sea base.

When ex-Senator Townsend, of Michigan, was running for reelection, a Detroit daily reported: "The East is opposed to him because of his leadership in the waterways movement, but the entire West from Ohio to Idaho is looking hopefully and earnestly to Michigan to give him the largest majority he has ever received. The east and the west will be 'listening in' election night—the east hoping for a reduced Townsend vote, the west hoping fervently that his vote will be a knockout blow to the eastern opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway."

I quote this to take the opportunity to point out that sweeping statements like these exaggerate the sectional feeling. As a matter of fact, of course, very few Eastern voters knew much about Townsend, and, East and West, most of the radio fans were listening in to the vaudeville or the football game or the real prize fight.

But while Duluth writers press the importance of what they call this "frustrated seaway," New York writers protest that the outlet should be through an enlarged Erie Canal if there is to be such a water route at all, and it is argued that the projected St. Lawrence route would be "Our

Dardanelles," liable to be closed against the West by Canadian or British government whenever disagreements invited this mode of coercion. In New England, meantime, there are fears that Boston would be injured as a port, besides the loss of her advantages by sea-borne commerce to the Pacific Coast. A few years ago Mayor Curley, of Boston, indignantly declared that such a waterway "would obliterate New England absolutely." . . .

There is a sense in which sectionalism is inevitable and desirable. There is and always has been a sectional geography in America based fundamentally upon geographic regions. There is a geography of political habit, a geography of opinion, of material interests, of racial stocks, of physical fitness, of social traits, of literature, of the distribution of men of ability, even of religious denominations. Professor Josiah Royce defined a "province" or section, in the sense in which I am using the word, as "any one part of a national domain which is geographically and socially sufficiently unified to have a true consciousness of its own ideals and customs and to possess a sense of its distinction from other parts of the country." It was the opinion of this eminent philosopher that the world needs now more than ever before the vigorous development of a highly organized provincial life to serve as a check upon mob psychology on a national scale, and to furnish that variety which is essential to vital growth and originality. With this I agree. But I wish also to urge here, as I have elsewhere, that there is always the danger that the province or section shall think of itself naively as the nation, that New England shall think that America is merely New England writ large, or the Middle West shall think that America is really the Middle West writ large, and then proceed to denounce the sections that do not perceive the accuracy of this view as wicked or ignorant and un-American. This kind of nationalism is a sectional mirage, but it is common, and has been common to all the sections, in their unconscious attitude if not in clear expression. It involves the assumption of a superiority of cul-

ture, of *Kultur*, to which good morals require that the nation as a whole must yield.

We must frankly face the fact that in this vast and heterogeneous nation, this sister of all Europe, regional geography is a fundamental fact; that the American peace has been achieved by restraining sectional selfishness and assertiveness and by coming to agreements rather than to reciprocal denunciation or to blows. . . .

The significance of the section in American history is that it is the faint image of a European nation and that we need to reexamine our history in the light of this fact. Our politics and our society have been shaped by sectional complexity and interplay not unlike what goes on between European nations. The greater sections are the result of the joint influence of the geologists' physiographic provinces and the colonizing stocks that entered them. The result is found in popular speech in which New England, the Middle States, the South, the Middle West, etc., are as common names as Massachusetts or Wisconsin. The Census divisions are more definite and official designations. Of course, the boundary lines are not definite and fixed. Neither are those of European nations. These larger sections have taken their characteristic and peculiar attitudes in American civilization in general.

We have furnished to Europe the example of a continental federation of sections over an area equal to Europe itself, and by substituting discussion and concession and compromised legislation for force, we have shown the possibility of international political parties, international legislative bodies, and international peace. Our party system and our variety in regional geography have helped to preserve the American peace. By having our combination of sections represented in a national legislative body, by possessing what may be called a League of Sections, comparable to a League of Nations, if it included political parties and a legislative body, we have enabled these minority sections to defend their interests and yet avoid the use of force.

B.

SECTIONALISM IN ACTION

As Turner remarks, many writers seem to identify sectionalism exclusively with the antagonisms between North and South, which centered around the slavery question and showed themselves most intensively in the thirty years preceding the Civil War. Although these were the most significant manifestations of sectionalism, the force is much broader than such a narrow focus would imply. Sectionalism has been involved in American political contests throughout the existence of the Republic, and it has appeared in connection with the widest possible range of subjects. The following selections suggest something of the variety of its forms and the constancy of its presence. These are only a sample, and numerous other illustrations would apply equally well.

1. *At the Constitutional Convention.* During the debates in the Constitutional Convention in 1787 much attention was given to the relative position of the large states and the small states in the new government, and representatives of each interest were jealous of the other. On June 30, however, Madison took the floor to argue that there was no real conflict of interests between large and small states, that if there were any clash of interests it was of a different sort.¹⁴

But he [Madison] contended that the States were divided into different interests not by their difference of size, but by other circumstances; the most material of which resulted partly from climate, but principally from the effects of their having or not having slaves. These two causes concurred in forming the great division of interests in the U. States. It did not lie between the large & small States: It lay between the Northern & Southern, and if any defensive power were necessary, it ought to be mutually given to these two interests. He was so strongly impressed with this important truth that he had been casting about in his mind for some expedient that would answer the purpose. The one which had occurred was that instead of proportioning the votes of the States in both branches, to their respective numbers of inhabitants computing the slaves in the ratio of 5 to 3, they should be represented in one branch according to the number of free inhabitants only; and in the other according to the whole no. counting the slaves as if free. By this arrangement the Southern Scale would have the advantage in one House, and the Northern in the other. He had been restrained from proposing this expedient by two considerations: one was his unwillingness to urge any diversity of interests on an occasion where it is but too apt to arise of itself—the other was, the inequality of powers that must be vested in the two branches, and which wd. destroy the equilibrium of interests.

2. *Sectional Fear of the Constitution.* When the Constitution was submitted for ratification, many of the states discussed the new instrument fully and carefully in their state conventions. Nowhere was the debate more thorough or more able than in Virginia, where Patrick Henry and other outstanding men led the opposition. The following extracts are taken from speeches by Patrick Henry and John Tyler (father of President John Tyler) in the Virginia Convention. Henry was particularly concerned with the possibility that the federal power of taxation might be used in a way that discriminated against Virginia and that Virginia's ten representatives would not be able to prevent it.¹⁵

[Henry] There is a striking difference, and great contrariety of interests between the states. They are naturally divided into carrying and productive states. This is an actual existing distinction which cannot be altered. The former are more numerous, and must prevail. What then will be the consequence of their contending interests, if the taxation of America is to go on in thirteen different shapes? This government subjects every thing to the northern majority. Is there not then a settled purpose to check the southern interest? We thus put unbounded power over our property in hands not having a common interest with us. How can the southern members prevent the adoption of the most oppressive mode of taxation in the southern states, as there is a majority in favor of the northern states? Sir, this is a picture so horrid, so wretched, so dreadful, that I need no longer dwell upon it.

[Tyler] If we are to be consolidated, let it be on better grounds. So long as climate will have effect on men, so long will the different climates of the United States render us different. Therefore a consolidation is contrary to our nature, and can only be supported by an arbitrary government.

3. *A Political Issue.* In 1792, while Washington was President, Congress took up the question of making a reapportionment of seats in the House of Representatives. Such a reapportionment is required after each ten-year census. A controversy developed, however, because southern members proposed to allow one representative for each 30,000 population. This would have operated to the advantage of the South since most southern states had populations which could be divided by 30,000, with only a limited number left over, while a number of northern states contained populations which could not be divided by 30,000 without leaving a large remainder of people in effect unrepresented. Massachusetts, for instance, exceeded a multiple of 30,000 by 25,327. Northern resistance to this quota finally led to the introduction of a bill which would indirectly have made the quota somewhat less than 30,000. This was contrary to the Constitution, which sets the minimum at 30,000 (Art. I, Sec. 2), but despite this constitutional objection the bill passed and was sent to the President. Thomas Jefferson tells in his journal what Washington did and why Washington was deeply concerned about the measure.¹⁶

Apr. 6. The President called on me before breakfast & first introduced some other matters, then fell on the representn bill which he had now in his possn for the 10th day. I had before given him

my opn in writing that the method of apportionmt was contrary to the constn. He agreed that it was contrary to the common understanding of that instrument, & to what was understood at the time by the makers of it: that yet it would bear the constn which the bill put, & he observed that the vote for & against the bill was perfectly geographical, a northern agt a southern vote, & he feared he should be thought to be taking side with a southern party. I admitted this motive of delicacy, but that it should not induce him to do wrong: urged the dangers to which the scramble for the fractionary members would always lead. He here expressed his fear that there would be ere long, a separation of the union; that the public mind seemed dissatisfied & tending to this. He went home, sent for Randolph the Atty Genl. desired him to get Mr. Madison immediately & come to me, & if we three concurred in opn that he should negative the bill, he desired to hear nothing more about it but that we would draw the instrument for him to sign. They came. Our minds had been before made up. We drew the instrumt. Randolph carried it to him & told him we all concurred in it. He walked with him to the door, and as if he still wished to get off, he said "& you say you approve of this yourself." "Yes, Sir, says Randolph, I do upon my honor." He sent it into the H. of Representatives instantly. A few of the hottest friends of the bill expressed passion, but the majority were satisfied, & both in and out of doors it gave pleasure to have at length an instance of the negative being exercised.

Written this the 9th. of April.

4. *An Economic Issue.* In 1792 Congress deliberated upon passing a bill to pay a bounty for the encouragement of the cod fisheries. These fisheries were, of course, located exclusively in the northeast, and Representative William B. Giles of Virginia spoke against the measure.¹⁷

He observed, that it is not unfrequent at this time to hear of an Eastern and Southern interest, and he had for some time silently and indignantly seen, or thought he saw, attempts by this means to influence the deliberations of this House upon almost every important question. . . . But one great mischief he apprehended from establishing the principle of the unrestrained right to grant bounties, will be, that it will make the difference of interest between Eastern and Southern, so far as they differ in their respective States of manufacture and agriculture, real, which is now only ideal. It will make that party real, which is now artificial. The jealousies and suspicions arising from *party*, will then have a substantial foundation, which now have no foundation in fact, but

are ingeniously stimulated by a few, for the purpose of effecting particular objects; . . .

5. *The Missouri Crisis.* In 1820, a bill to admit Missouri as a slave state raised a sudden burst of opposition. The House passed a bill designed to prevent Missouri entering the union as a slave state, and the Senate defeated this bill. The congressional session ended without a solution of the problem, but at a subsequent session the Senate attempted a compromise based upon linking the statehood applications of Missouri and Maine, one slave, the other free, and dividing the Louisiana Purchase area by a territorial line. The measure was then sent to the House of Representatives. Congressman William Plumer, in letters to his father, described its reception.¹⁸

Dear Father, . . . We are all still engaged, as deeply as ever, in the Missouri business, which seems to be almost interminable—The Senate has sent down what they call a compromise—that is, they have connected Maine & Missouri, without restriction, & have agreed to exclude Slavery from the territory north of 36½, which would leave it in Missouri, Arcansaw, & one other state—We shall separate the two bills in our House by a considerable majority, & I think there will finally be found in the senate a majority of one or two for receding from their amendment—but this is uncertain—& many believe that neither state will be admitted this session—Many of the Southern members openly avow their intention—They say they have now an equality in the Senate, eleven slave holding, & eleven free state, & they are determined not to admit a free state without bringing in at the same time a slave state to preserve the balance—They also throw out many threats, & talk loudly of seperation—Governor Pinckney of South Carolina, in a very violent speech in our House, said that "if this course was persisted in, the Southern States *must* & *would* dissolve the Union"—The Virginians talk in the same style—& Mr Clay declares that he will go home and raise troops, if necessary, to defend the people of Missouri—But this is all talk, intended to frighten us out of our purpose—& is so understood—There is however much said about a compromise—& I am afraid that there will [be] some flinching on this subject.—We have now a clear majority—& nothing but firmness is necessary to give us all the success, on which we have ever calculated, that is to say, getting Maine in, & keeping Missouri out.

Many of the southern people, & particularly the Virginians, talk coolly & deliberately of a separation of the States, or at least of an attempt to deprive the General Government of some portion of its powers—Besides this business of Missouri,

they say that the General Government is every year setting up new claims & pretensions—They mention the establishment of the Bank; the juris-

diction assumed in so many disputed cases by the Supreme Court; & many other incroachments, as they deem them of the Government generally.

C.

LIKE TWO DISTINCT CURRENTS

In the study of nationalism and sectionalism, neither force, taken by itself, is difficult to understand. Both result from the presence of fairly well-defined conditions such as Kohn and Turner have described; both manifest themselves in easily recognized forms. The subtlety of the problem lies in their relationship to one another and in the fact that, though they are antagonistic, both can flourish simultaneously, both can be harbored in the mind of an individual, both can appear as different facets of the same thing. The evaluation of the relative strength of the two at any given time becomes, therefore, immensely difficult and cannot be reduced to any degree of certainty. The paradoxical and extremely complex character of this relationship is suggested in the selections that follow. In these selections the student should seek for evidences of both nationalism and sectionalism and should attempt at least a tentative estimate as to which weighs more in the balance in each individual case.

1. *Dual Loyalties: An Objective Report.* Harriet Martineau, an English writer who came to America in 1834 for a two-year visit, later wrote an account of *Society in America* (1837), in which she included a chapter on "Sectional Prejudice."¹⁹

It is the practice at Washington to pay the Members of Congress, not only a per diem allowance, but their travelling expenses; at so much per twenty miles. Two Members of Congress from Missouri made charges widely different in amount. Complaints were made that the Members were not confined to a mail route, and that the country had to pay for any digressions the honourable gentlemen might be in the humour to make. Upon this, a Member observed that, so far from wishing to confine the congressional travellers to a mail route, he would, if possible, prescribe the condition that they should travel, both in coming and going, through every State of the Union. Any money thus expended, would be, he considered, a cheap price to pay for the conquest of prejudices and dispersion of unfriendly feelings, which would be the consequence of the rambles he proposed.

The Members of Congress from the north like to revert to the day when there were only two universities, Harvard and Yale, to which all the youth of the Union repaired for education. The southern members love to boast of the increase of colleges, so that every State will soon be educating its own youth. The northern men miss the sweet sounds of acknowledgment which used to meet their ears, as often as past days were referred to—the grateful mention of the New England retreats where the years of preparation for active life were spent. The southern men are mortified at the supposition that everything intellectual

must come out of New England. When they boast that Virginia has produced almost all their Presidents, they are met by the boast that New England has furnished almost all the school-masters, professors, and clergy of the country. While the north is still fostering a reverence for the Union, the south loses no opportunity of enlarging lovingly on the virtue of passionate attachment to one's native state.

There is much nature and much reason in all this. It is true that there is advantage in the youth of the whole country being brought together within college walls, at the age when warm friendships are formed. They can hardly quarrel very desperately in Congress, after having striven, and loved, and learned together, in their bright early days. The cadets at West Point spoke warmly to me of this. They told me that when a youth is coming from afar, the youths who have arrived from an opposite point of the compass prepare to look cold upon him and quiz him, and receive him frigidly enough; but the second Sunday seldom comes round before they wonder at him and themselves, and acknowledge that he might almost have been born in their own State. On the other hand, it is true that it would be an absurdity and a hardship to the dwellers in the south and west to have no means of educating their youth at home; but to be obliged to send them a thousand miles in pursuit of necessary learning. It is also true that medical colleges should abound; that peculiar diseases, incident to climate and locality, may be studied on the spot. In this, as in many other cases, some good must be sacrificed for the attainment of a greater good.

The question is, need sectional prejudices increase under the new arrangements? Are there no means of counteracting this great evil, except

the ancient methods? Is West Point the last spot whereon common interests may rally, and whence state jealousies may be excluded?

I should be sorry if the answer were unfavourable; for this Sectional Prejudice, carried beyond the point of due political vigilance, is folly,—childish folly. Events prove it to be so. Deadly political enemies meet at Washington, and snarl and declaim at one another with mighty fierceness. They find themselves, some sunny day, lying on the grass under the shade of a tree, at the country-house of an acquaintance; they rise up cordial friends. They have actually discussed the question of questions, the American System and Nullification; and yet they rise up cordial friends. Again; a Boston gentleman and his lady travel for health through the south and west. They hear abuse of their State and city in abundance by the roadside; but their hearts are touched by the hospitality and friendliness they meet under every roof. Again; the planter carries his family to a Rhode Island bathing place, for the hot season: and there he finds some to whom he can open his heart about his domestic troubles, caused by slavery; he gains their sympathy, and carries away their esteem. The sectional hatred, if not an abstraction, is founded mainly on abstractions, and gives way at once when the parties are confronted. Does it not deserve to be called childish folly?

Yet "hatred" is not too strong a term for this sectional prejudice. Many a time in America have I been conscious of that pang and shudder which are felt only in the presence of hatred. I question whether the enmity between the British and the Americans, at the most exasperating crisis of the war, could ever have been more intense than some that I have seen flashing in the eyes, and heard from the lips, of Americans against fellow-citizens in distant sections of their country. I have scarcely known whether to laugh or to mourn when I have been told that the New England people are all pedlars or canting priests; that the people of the south are all heathens; and those of the west all barbarians. Nay, I was even told in New York that the Rhode Island people were all heathens, and the New Jersey folks no better. Some Baltimore ladies told me that the Philadelphia ladies say that no Baltimore lady knows how to put on a bonnet: but that the Philadelphians have something worse the matter with them than that; for that they do not know how to be hospitable to strangers. Without stopping to settle which is the gravest of these heavy charges, I am anxious to bear my testimony against the correctness of either. I saw some pretty bonnets, most becomingly worn, at Baltimore; and I can speak confidently to the hospitality of Philadelphia.

Trifling as some instances appear of the manifestation of this puerile spirit, it sometimes, it

always, issues in results which are no trifle;—always, because the spirit of jealousy is a deadly curse to him who is possessed by it, whether it be founded on fact, or no. It cannot co-exist with a generous patriotism, one essential requisite of which is an enlarged faith in fellow-citizens. All republicans are patriotic, more or less frequently and loftily. If every American will look into himself at the moment he is glowing with patriotism, he will find his sectional prejudices melted away and gone, for the season. The Americans feel this in their travels abroad, when their country is attacked. They yearn towards the remotest dwellers in their country as if they were the nearest and dearest. Would they could always feel thus at home, and in the absence of provocation!

2. *Dual Loyalties: A Subjective Expression.*

In 1845, when Congress was considering the annexation of Texas, Alexander H. Stephens of Georgia, afterward Vice President of the Confederate States, delivered in the House of Representatives an address supporting annexation. His speech touched upon several aspects of sectionalism and nationalism. In it the student can find a subjective expression, in Stephens' own thinking, of the same dualism which was expressed objectively in Miss Martineau's observations. At the beginning of the speech Stephens stated that he favored annexation but that he did not regard the possession of Texas as necessary for reasons of military security. He then continued to disclaim certain other motives before coming to the reasons which he did accept.²⁰

Neither am I much influenced by the pecuniary advantages to be derived from the union of that country with this—the benefits of trade, commerce, &c. So far as these are concerned, the accession will be to the interests exclusively of the North and West. This section which I represent will have no part or share in them. The North will have an enlarged market for their manufactures, and will have a new competitor in the field in the growth of the raw material which she now has to buy, and by which she will be enabled to get it cheaper. The same with the West with their breadstuffs; while the South will have nothing to sell to the people of Texas, but will feel sorely her formidable competition in the production of cotton and sugar, her great staples. If I looked to those views, therefore, only, I should most certainly oppose it, in behalf of my section; for I take it for granted that, notwithstanding the same staples might and would be grown in Texas, whether in the Union or out of it, yet they would not be grown to such extent, and the whole resources of the country would never be so speedily and fully developed

out of the Union, as they will be if once brought within the wholesome influence of our laws and institutions. I am, however, influenced by other considerations. These I will state.

In the first place, the people of that country are mostly emigrants from this. They are of the Amerigo-Anglo-Saxon race. They are from us, and of us; bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh. Our sympathies are with them; and they have an attachment for our institutions and form of government, and, in their struggles for the establishment of the same, it is but natural that we should be disposed to extend them a helping hand, though our individual interest may not thereby advanced. [sic]

Again: I consider it important that the cotton and sugar growing interests of this continent, as far as possible, should be subject to the same laws—to prevent undue advantages, secured by treaty, separate regulations of trade, or otherwise, in the markets of the world. If Texas should remain out of the Union, and a rivalry should spring up there to the staples of the South, our interests might be greatly injured by regulations with other countries, partial to theirs, and discriminating against ours. This cannot be, if the whole be made subject to the same laws and policy. Again: a large section of that country lies upon navigable waters flowing into the Mississippi, and must always seek a market through the outlet of that river. More than three hundred thousand dollars' worth of cotton, produced in Texas year before last, was shipped from New Orleans; first paying a duty upon entering the limits of our country, and then being entitled to the drawback upon final shipment. All this is inconvenient, and will continue to increase. And the history of the world shows the necessity, for the peace and quiet of a country, that the navigation of waters should be free and equal to those who live upon their borders. The people of the western country, on the upper Mississippi and its branches, felt the difficulties attending a contrary state of things when Spain held the mouth of that noble stream. Our commerce, upon arriving at New Orleans, was subject to onerous restrictions; difficulties threatening the peace of this country were the result; and to avoid them, was perhaps the controlling reason with Mr. Jefferson for the acquisition of Louisiana. To avoid similar ones between this government and the people of that section to which I have alluded, it is important that it should be brought into this Union.

Again: I am in favor of it because it will afford an outlet, a retreat, for our accumulating population. It will open a new field for the pioneer. Our people are disposed to roam. They like new countries and new lands; and there they will have opened up a great southwest within our own

country, to which the tide of emigration may flow—to which our people may go for the purpose of gain, adventure, and enterprise, carrying with them their customs, their habits, their laws, and "household gods," without incurring the liability of expatriation, or forfeiting the inestimable rights and privileges of being American citizens.

With this question is also to be decided another and a greater one; which is, whether the limits of this republic are ever to be enlarged? This is an important step in settling the principle of our future extension. Nor do I concur with gentlemen who seem to apprehend so much danger from that quarter. We were the other day reminded by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Collamer] of the growth of the Roman empire, which went on increasing and enlarging until it became unwieldy, and fell of its own weight; and of the present extent of England, stretching to all sections of the world, governing one-sixth of the human family, and which is now hardly able to keep together its extensive parts. But there is a wide difference between these cases. Rome extended her dominions by conquests. She made the rude inhabitants of her provinces subjects and slaves. She compelled them to bear the yoke; *jugum subire* was the requisition of her chieftains; and none who were overcome by her arms could escape the ignominy. England extends her dominion and power upon a different principle. Hers is the principle of colonization. Her distant provinces and dependencies are subject to her laws, but are deprived of the rights of representation. But with us a new system has commenced, suited to and characteristic of the age. It is, if you please, the system of a confederation of States, or a republic formed by the union of the people of separate independent States or communities, yielding so much of the national character or sovereign powers as are necessary for national and foreign purposes, and retaining all others for local and domestic objects to themselves separately and severally. And who shall undertake to say to what extent this system may not go? Mr. Madison laid down the rule, in speaking of our system, which he called the "basis of unmixed and extensive republics," that the "natural limit" to which it may go is "that distance from the centre which will barely allow the representatives of the people to meet as often as may be necessary for the administration of public affairs." And upon this rule, in consideration of the improvements of the age, the facilities of travel and the transmission of intelligence, who can say that this entire continent is too wide and extensive?

The distance from this place to Oregon and California, in a few years, will be travelled in as short a time as it was to Georgia when Mr. Madison wrote. Then it required from twenty

to thirty days for a representative from that State, our extreme southwest at that time, to come to the seat of government; and now the same distance is performed in three days. And representatives from Louisiana, five or six hundred miles the other side, now require less than half the time then required by those from Georgia, to come from their remote districts. And who can tell what improvements for the speed of travel are yet in store? . . .

We live, sir, not only in a new hemisphere, but indeed, in a new age; and we have started a new system of government, as new and as different from those of the Old World as the Baconian system of philosophy was novel and different from the Aristotlean, and destined, perhaps, to produce quite as great a revolution in the moral and political world as his did in the scientific. Ours is the true American system, and, though it is still regarded by some as an experiment, yet, so far, it has succeeded beyond the expectations of many of its best friends. And who is prepared now to rise up and say, "Thus far shall it go, but no farther?"

But I am in favor of this measure for another reason. It is, as the honorable chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs said in his opening speech, in our sense and in our view, a sectional question—a southern question. It will not promote our pecuniary interests, but it will give us political weight and importance; and to this view I am not insensible. And though I have a patriotism that embraces, I trust, all parts of the Union, and which causes me to rejoice to see all prosperous and happy; and though I believe I am free from the influence of unjust prejudices and jealousies towards any part or section, yet I must confess that my feelings of attachment are most ardent towards that with which all my interests and associations are identified. And is it not natural and excusable that they should be? The South is my home—my fatherland. There sleep the ashes of my sire and grandsires; there are my hopes and prospects; with her my fortunes are cast; her fate is my fate, and her destiny my destiny. Nor do I wish "to hoax" gentlemen from other sections on this point, as some have intimated. I am candid and frank in my acknowledgement. This acquisition will give additional power to the southwestern section in the national councils; and for this purpose I want it—not that I am desirous to see an extension of the "area of slavery," as some gentlemen have said its effects

would be. I am no defender of slavery in the abstract. Liberty always had charms for me, and I would rejoice to see all the sons of Adam's family, in every land and clime, in the enjoyment of those rights which are set forth in our declaration of independence as "natural and inalienable," if a stern necessity, bearing the marks and impress of the hand of the Creator himself, did not, in some cases, interpose and prevent. Such is the case with the States where slavery now exists. But I have no wish to see it extended to other countries; and if the annexation of Texas were for the *sole purpose* of extending slavery where it does not now and would not otherwise exist, I should oppose it. This is not its object, nor will it be its effect. Slavery already exists in Texas, and will continue to exist there. The same necessity that prevails in the southern States prevails there, and will prevail wherever the Anglo-Saxon and African race are blended in the same proportions. It matters not, so far as this institution is concerned, whether Texas be in the Union or out of it. That, therefore, is not my object; but it is the political advantages it will secure, preserving a proper balance between the different sections of the country. This is my object; and is it not proper and right?

If we look around, we see the East, by her economy, her industry, and enterprise, by her commerce, navigation, and mechanic arts, growing opulent, strong, and powerful. The West, which a few years ago was nothing but an unbroken wilderness, embracing the broad and fertile valley of the Mississippi, where the voice of civilization was never heard, is now teeming with its millions of population. The tide of emigration, still rolling in that direction, has already reached the base of the Rocky mountains, and will soon break over those lofty barriers and be diffused in the extensive plains of Oregon. Already the West vies for the ascendancy on this floor; and why should not the South also be advancing? Are her limits never to be enlarged, and her influence and power never to be increased?

Is she to be left behind in this race for distinction and aggrandizement, if you please? As one of her sons, I say no. Let her, too, enter the glorious rivalry; not with feelings of strife, jealousy, or envy—such sentiments are not characteristic of her people—but with aspirations prompted by the spirit of a laudable emulation and an honorable ambition.

IV

Life in the North and West

EACH great area was evolving in its own way. Each had its own type of people, its own geographic and economic basis, its own particular economic and social interests.

FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER

CONTENTS

Questions for Study	96
Historical Background	97
Part I: Measures of Sectional Distinction . . .	99
Part II: Social Patterns of the North	106
Part III: Social Patterns of the West	117

Q U E S T I O N S F O R S T U D Y

1. Why are the average dates of latest killing frost in Spring and earliest killing frost in Fall more significant than average maximum temperature in differentiating one section from another?
2. Specify five aspects of life in which climatic conditions have influenced the South and tended to make it more distinctively a section.
3. In 1850, how did the population density of New England compare with that of the states south of the Potomac? With those west of the Alleghenies? How would this factor influence the economic life and development of the areas in question?
4. Exactly what proportion of the cities with more than 10,000 population in 1850 were located in the slave states? What proportion in the cotton states? Apply these same questions for cities of more than 20,000 population.
5. In the event of antagonisms between agriculture and industry, would the West (according to the table of employments on p. 105) have been a firm ally of either North or South or would it have been an intermediary between them?
6. How does the farm life described by Sarah Anna Emery show the beginnings of the later industrialism which Harriet Martineau found at Lynn, Massachusetts?
7. In comparing Miss Martineau's description of a mill town with that of the *Harbinger*, is there any way in which to explain the discrepancies other than to suppose that one of the accounts is false?
8. The simple farm communities described by Emery and Goodrich, and the metropolis of New York as described by Trollope seem to present a complete contrast. Can one find, however, in New York, either in modified form or in their original form, any of the same traits of character or the same social objectives which appear in the accounts of farm life?
9. Although the squatter, the small farmer, and the well-to-do farmer are described as separate types, they have many characteristics in common. What are some of the traits evident in all of them?
10. Is there any similarity between life in New England as described by Goodrich at the beginning of the century and life in the West at a later time? Does this justify the view that the West did not have a lasting sectional identity in the fullest sense?
11. Did life in the West tend to brutalize the character of those who, in migrating, had been forced to abandon many of the amenities of life?

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Few subjects lend themselves so readily to exaggeration as does the theme of sectional difference. If the mind focuses upon the points of distinction between two regions it can completely black out the points of similarity. Thus, only a few years ago, Carl Carmer, comparing Alabama with other states outside the South, declared: "The Congo is not more different from Massachusetts or Kansas or California." A certain literary license, of course, must be allowed for this observation, in the same way that we must avoid taking literally Sinclair Lewis' statement, apropos of American standardization, that: "A stranger suddenly dropped into the business center of Zenith could not have told whether he was in a city of Oregon or Georgia, Ohio or Maine, Oklahoma or Manitoba." The mere fact that both remarks could carry a certain plausibility is proof enough that questions of sectional similarity or dissimilarity are elusive and easy to overstate. The phenomenon of sectionalism is based largely upon physical facts but expresses itself in psychological attitudes. Political controversy sometimes whips up these attitudes, as Turner points out, by stating a sectional case in terms of a sharp dualism which in reality does not exist. But if enough people believe it exists, the illusion becomes as important historically as the reality would have been.

Because of these imponderables it is well to take nothing for granted in an analysis of sectionalism and to begin by dealing with aspects which can be measured in the most objective fashion. This involves rejecting, or at least questioning, all sweeping assumptions about the character of the southern or northern or western people, their temperament, or their sense of values. For instance, it is traditional to regard the South as a region of gaiety where religious tenets do not inhibit pleasure, while New England is stereotyped as a stronghold of stern, repressive Puritanism. During the twentieth century, however, the South (sometimes called the Bible Belt) clung to Fundamentalist orthodoxy and to Prohibition more tenaciously than any other part of the nation, while the Catholic church assumed a dominant place among the religious organizations of "Puritan" New England. Similarly, American writers have customarily regarded the social equality of the West as a factor causing that region to take the lead in social and economic reforms, but this view is challenged today by students who contend that "the demand for economic equality is generally born out of conditions of social inequality" and that the cities of the East have in fact done more to secure reform legislation than the prairies of the West.

With these cautions in mind, one may now turn in this Problem to an analysis of sectionalism. Problem III has shown with what vigor it flourished and in what forms it made its early appearances. But it is not enough to show that such a trend existed; analysis must further explain why it existed, what distinctions caused it, and what sources of friction converted mere dissimilarities into antagonisms.

Here it is important to distinguish sharply between points of mere dissimilarity and those of actual antagonism and to guard against assuming that dissimilarity must, in itself, produce antagonism. Modern society, both national and international, abounds in situations where diversity produces interdependence and reciprocal advantage; indeed, the whole system of division of labor underlying the economic structure of the modern world is a recognition of this principle. Agricultural regions need markets for their produce in industrial cities, and industry in turn depends upon farmers to buy automobiles and farm machinery. Hence it is one thing to show that North, South, and West were dissimilar but quite another to prove them antagonistic. Sectional distinctions and sectional issues are both important but are in no sense the same thing.

Students of sectionalism vary in the number of major regions which they recog-

nize. In the Colonial period the New England colonies, the Middle colonies, and the Southern or Planting colonies seemed to form three clearly distinguishable groups. In the nineteenth century, however, the distinctions between New England and the Middle Atlantic states diminished, but by no means disappeared, and a new region or regions came into being with the westward advance of population. There are perhaps several Wests: certainly the Pacific Coast, the mining and cattle raising area, and the so-called Middle West are distinguishable as are also the Pacific Northwest and the Great Southwest; before these areas were all settled the Old Southwest of Jefferson Davis and the Old Northwest of Abraham Lincoln presented points of contrast as well as points of similarity. But the problem of sectionalism centers primarily upon two regions, North and South, which divided with ever-increasing sharpness, and a third, the West, which began by presenting its most salient points of difference in its earliest stage of development and steadily grew to resemble more closely the older regions as it gained maturity. In the interplay of sections, therefore, we have two which became increasingly antagonistic with the passage of time and a third which tended to be drawn more and more into the orbits of the other two. When North and South were ultimately divided into the United States and the Confederate States, there was some talk of a Mississippi Valley Confederacy, but in fact the lower West—Tennessee, Arkansas, Texas, etc.—went with the South, while the upper West—Ohio to Iowa and Minnesota—went with the North, as did California and Oregon.

This Problem deals first with some of the general aspects of sectional distinction. It then presents a more extensive record of economic and social conditions in two of the sections—the North and West. This material fully occupies the space allotted to a single Problem, and for that reason a comparable presentation of the social and economic conditions of the South is reserved for the following Problem. After completing this survey of social and economic conditions, Problem V also turns back to the question of the interplay of sections and deals with evidences of conflicting interests or emotional antagonisms which sharpened sectional cleavages. Thus this Problem and Problem V form an over-all unit, beginning with the question of sectional distinctions, following with material on each of the sections as such, and ending with an inquiry into factors of sectional dissension.

Part I.

MEASURES OF SECTIONAL DISTINCTION

From early times the American colonies developed dissimilarities which can be defined by the most objective standards. These dissimilarities were especially outstanding between the New England group and the group consisting of South Atlantic and West Indian colonies. The New England settlements had adopted a town-meeting form of local government, had maintained the Congregational Church with its Puritan creed as their primary religious organization, and had developed fisheries, shipbuilding, and shipping as important parts of their economy. The South Atlantic colonies, by contrast, used the county as a unit of local government, adhered primarily to the episcopal system of the Church of England, and produced for their livelihood such staple crops as tobacco, indigo, and rice. But in contrasting these two, it would be an error to suppose that complete similarity or complete harmony existed among colonies in the same group. There was much ill will, for instance, between Massachusetts, which enforced Congregational authority, and Rhode Island, which allowed religious freedom. Similarly, suspicion existed between Virginia and North Carolina, because the Carolinians regarded Virginians as land monopolists and Virginians considered Carolina a nest of pirates.

Later, as Problem III has already shown, people began to think of their distinctiveness in explicit sectional terms. If at first there were no categories of colonies or states which legalized and which prohibited slavery, Mason and Dixon's Line could nevertheless be regarded as the boundary between the "carrying" and the "planting" states. A young man such as Philip Fithian, traveling into another section for the first time, could sense vast differences between Virginia and his native New Jersey.

Similarly, if the imaginary boundary of a surveyor's line separated the North and South, the emphatically tangible boundary of the Appalachian Mountains set apart the emigrants who began to settle beyond the mountain barrier in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Inhabitants of this region were known as "men of the Western Waters," and they formed the vanguard of an army of settlers who acquired the distinctive stamp of the pioneer West.

Inevitably these regional differences among North, South, and West are sometimes sensed in areas where the real cannot be separated from the illusory. The element of intangibility cannot be denied, but an analysis will best approach the question through attention to those factors which can be measured statistically and validated on a purely factual basis. With that purpose the selections here have been chosen first to deal with climate, population density, distribution of population, occupations of peoples, and economic value of certain key types of assets. All these lend themselves to precise, nonspeculative enumeration. After these factors have been appraised the less tangible aspects of sectional identity are then presented through selections which depict patterns of living and traits of personality in each of the major regions.

A.

CLIMATE

The problem of sectionalism is filled with difficult questions of cause and effect: Did the plantation system cause slavery, or did slavery cause the plantation system? Does the devotion to a single crop such as tobacco or cotton cause a debtor status, or does the debtor status cause concentration upon a single crop? Did the South draw away from the union because it believed in states' rights, or did it believe in states' rights because it was drawing away from the union for other reasons? These questions are complicated by the fact that each involves other questions of the deeds or institutions of man, interacting upon one another. But there is at least one distinction between North and South which has not been influenced or modified by human action—climate. Our analysis, therefore, begins with that feature, offering, first, data from the United States Weather Bureau to illustrate

the extent and character of sectional differences in climate and, then, comment by two authorities on the effects of climatic conditions upon the life and economy of the South as a distinctive section.

1. *Climatic Conditions.* The data on the opposite page have been selected to show leading climate characteristics of certain points ranging from the extreme north to the extreme south of the eastern part of the United States. No attempt is made to include other parts of the country; indeed the data given are merely the minimum necessary to show the variation of climate in different latitudes. It is generally recognized that climatic conditions in the interior and along the coast are not the same, and therefore both interior points and coastal points have been chosen. Average temperatures are given for the months of January, April, July, and October, which are the characteristic months of their respective seasons, and the average maximum for these same months is given—that is, the average of daily highs for that month. The length of the growing season is also given as shown by the average dates of the last killing frost in spring and the earliest killing frost in autumn. Finally, the annual snowfall in inches is shown. All averages are based upon records of many years.¹

2. *Climatic Factors in the Life of the South.* An interpretation of these factors by Ulrich B. Phillips follows.²

Let us begin by discussing the weather, for that has been the chief agency in making the South distinctive. It fostered the cultivation of the staple crops, which promoted the plantation system, which brought the importation of negroes, which not only gave rise to chattel slavery but created a lasting race problem. These led to controversy and regional rivalry for power, which produced apprehensive reactions and culminated in a stroke for independence. Thus we have the house that Jack built, otherwise known for some years as the Confederate States of America.

The South is nowhere tropical except at the tip of Florida, for it has winters with killing frosts. The characteristic feature is merely the length of the summers. The growing season lasts on an average six months at Baltimore, Louisville and St. Louis; seven at Norfolk, Atlanta and Memphis; eight at Columbia, Montgomery and Dallas; and nine at Charleston, New Orleans and Galveston. The climate has fostered the cultivation of tobacco in the first zone, cotton in the second and third, and rice and sugar cane in the fourth.

The summers are not merely long, but bakingly hot, with temperatures ranging rather steadily in

the eighties and nineties of the Fahrenheit scale. In the droughts which occur at some time nearly every summer, when the sky is like brass and the ground is like iron, all shallow-rooted vegetation is parched. Thus the country in general is not well adapted to grass or to the small grains except rice, to which water is artificially supplied. The deficit of grass curtails cattle-raising, and this restricts the supply of barnyard manure and makes it hard to maintain the fertility of the fields. So were it not for its own particular staples, the South would hardly prosper from agriculture in competition with the great grasslands of the world.

Gastronomic resource is fostered by the climate, to stimulate appetites which the hot weather makes languid. Indeed most of the habits of life are affected. In the tedious heat work is hard, indolence easy; speech is likely to be slow and somewhat slurred; manners are soft; and except when tempers are hot, the trend is toward easy-going practices even among healthy people. But the climate has operated through the hookworm to make many half-invalid.

Still further, whether in the very distant past or in more recent times, the climate has been responsible not only for the original forest covering of the land but in a measure also for the quality of the soil. In even the coldest of the glacial ages the sheet of ice which blanketed the northerly regions and, slowly moving, pulverized, transported and intermixed their soils, encountered rays too strong and winds too warm to cross Mason and Dixon's line. The soil virtually everywhere is accordingly the product of rocks disintegrated on the very spot or somewhere directly uphill or upstream. Most of the soils are thus mere sand and clay in varying proportions, with little or no lime and no humus except perhaps on the surface. The lack of deep frost in winter and the consequent lack of mellowing thaw in spring leaves the ground hard-packed the year round. This diminishes the absorbent capacity of the clay, and by the same token shortens the beneficial influence of rains and heightens their deleterious effects. The Southern rain seldom sifts but commonly pelts from a great height, and by its pelting packs any plowed surface. Most of the rain in the characteristic downpours must accordingly run off. Great floods on the Southern streams are on record from times when but little of the forest had been felled in their drainage basins. . . . Such havoc was happily seldom; but the mere heavy rains of commonplace occurrence impaired the soils by leaching the flat lands and eroding the hills.

Place	Average monthly temperature				Average maximum temperature				Average last killing frost, spring	Average first killing frost, autumn	Average number days, growing season	Average annual snowfall, inches
	Jan.	April	July	Oct.	Jan.	April	July	Oct.				
Eastport, Maine	20.7	38.8	60.2	47.5	28.5	45.2	68.7	53.7	Apr. 28	Oct. 22	177	74.3
Worcester, Mass.	25.1	45.7	71.2	51.5	33.1	54.6	80.3	60.5	May 3	Oct. 9	159	56.0
Boston, Mass.	28.2	46.4	72.0	53.5	36.1	54.5	80.5	61.4	Apr. 16	Oct. 26	193	43.8
Rome, N. Y.	20.4	44.9	69.7	48.6	28.3	55.3	81.0	57.9	May 11	Oct. 1	143	103.9
New York, N. Y.	30.9	48.8	73.9	55.9	37.8	56.9	81.8	63.2	Apr. 11	Nov. 6	209	32.5
Scranton, Pa.	27.2	47.7	71.8	52.3	34.9	57.4	82.1	61.6	Apr. 21	Oct. 14	176	45.7
Philadelphia, Pa.	32.9	51.9	76.4	57.3	39.9	60.8	84.5	65.3	Apr. 7	Oct. 29	205	23.1
Washington, D. C.	33.9	53.5	76.8	57.0	41.7	63.5	86.4	66.9	Apr. 11	Oct. 23	195	21.7
Richmond, Va.	38.2	56.8	78.0	59.8	47.5	67.2	87.6	70.1	Mar. 31	Nov. 2	216	13.4
Norfolk, Va.	41.4	56.9	78.6	61.8	49.0	65.9	86.7	69.4	Mar. 24	Nov. 16	237	8.8
Raleigh, N. C.	41.7	59.1	78.3	60.9	50.7	69.7	87.6	70.6	Mar. 27	Nov. 5	223	7.9
Wilmington, N. C.	47.2	61.6	79.5	64.4	56.3	70.6	86.9	73.4	Mar. 21	Nov. 15	239	1.7
Columbia, S. C.	46.5	63.2	80.4	64.1	55.5	74.1	89.9	74.4	Mar. 17	Nov. 18	246	2.5
Charleston, S. C.	50.2	64.7	81.6	67.6	57.9	72.1	87.9	74.6	Feb. 20	Dec. 11	294	.4
Savannah, Ga.	51.8	66.0	80.0	67.7	60.4	74.9	89.6	75.8	Mar. 1	Nov. 25	269	.1
Montgomery, Ala.	48.6	65.4	81.6	66.2	57.5	75.6	90.9	76.3	Mar. 8	Nov. 13	250	.8
Jacksonville, Fla.	55.6	68.6	81.4	70.7	64.4	77.4	89.8	78.2	Feb. 16	Dec. 7	294	—
New Orleans, La.	54.7	69.0	82.4	71.1	62.3	76.7	89.3	78.2	Feb. 18	Dec. 5	291	.3
Miami, Fla.	67.6	73.9	81.6	77.6	74.3	79.7	86.9	82.8	*	*	—	—

* In 35 years, killing frost in spring, 9 years, in autumn, 3 years.

3. *Climate and Culture.* Rupert Vance relates the specific problem of the South to the general problem of English and European peoples in semitropical areas and distinguishes between the actual physical influence of the climate and the psychological influence of beliefs about climate.³

Certainly climate has not been neglected in the popular estimate of the South. It, in fact, has been regarded by many as the region's *raison d'être*. Southern reactions to climate have been popularly estimated to range all the way from the forced importation of tropic laborers to a change in the Anglo-Saxon temperament and a lowering of biological adequacy similar to that encountered in tropic climes. Thus by some the southern United States is regarded as the scene of a geographical human experiment of great significance. In this area the white man has wagered against climate, and history and science are yet undecided as to whether he has won or lost. Thus the economic geographers, Jones and Whittlesey, can write: "The suitability of this climate for Europeans is in dispute as evidenced by the introduction of colored races into southern United States and Natal." It may be admitted that in the usual course of things the European goes to the tropics, and assumes the white man's burden by organizing the native laborers under the plantation system for the production of such staples as tea, rubber, coffee, bananas, cotton or sugar cane. The plantation, as A. G. Keller has pointed out in his work on *Colonization*, is the mode agriculture assumes in the tropics.

While partly accounted for by imperialism and the European economic surplus for foreign investment, the plantation owes much of its actual structure to the influence of climate. To W. Z. Ripley "a colonial policy in the tropics means a permanent servile native population" largely because "one of the many things expressly forbidden to all colonists in the tropics is agricultural labor. It would be a waste of energy to give citations to prove this, for every work on acclimatization insists upon the necessity of this precaution."

Now it is held the American South took an opposite course to the same end. The area itself partook of the nature of a colony. Possessing a subtropic climate, land in abundance, and a great scarcity of labor, the province imported both the plantation form and the servile labor to man it. Thus, in the course of time arose the nineteenth century superstition that no white man could work in southern fields and keep his health. It was contradicted at the time, needless to say, by thousands of yeoman farmers and their wives who tilled fields of cotton and corn alongside the

plantation in its palmiest days. Then, as if to prove whether an agriculture so constructed could stand alone, the South saw its system of chattel slavery abolished.

Thus, one may claim that the whole South was organized around an attempt to escape the handicaps of a subtropic climate. The argument has been extended to claim a climatic change of temperament. For the first time in history, we are told, Nordics of the English, Teutonic, or Anglo-Saxon persuasion have lived below the 39th parallel. They have so lived, labored, and multiplied for nine generations. "Not elsewhere in the world over," writes E. N. Vallandigham, "have Englishmen dwelt continuously in large numbers under semi-tropical conditions for as much as three generations." The British official class in India have been constantly renewed from the homeland. Vallandigham, in 1907, saw the descendants of middle-class Englishmen in the process of becoming fiery Latins under the southern sun, and called the southerners "our men of the Midi." He saw the southerners taking on the characteristics and temperament of the European races that fringe the Mediterranean. Ardent in love, deadly in jealousy, fiery yet steady in physical courage, soft of speech and manner yet easily roused to flaming anger, provincial and supersensitive to outside criticism, the southerner had gained a warmth and color which made him seem to Vallandigham a different race from the Yankee. The impassive Englishman has been tempered by the southern sun with the tinge of the South European. So runs the theory, and it is as neat as it is incapable of demonstration. . . .

When we come to the biology of heat loss we find that the eighteenth century superstition that white men could not work in the fields in the South was never more than a superstition. . . .

The South today is sprinkled full of settlers from every part of Europe and the North who work with as great impunity and efficiency as either natives or Negroes. So passes the superstition. It belongs with Frederick Mayratt's view that the climate of America has caused a deterioration in the original physique of English settlers. Until further researches present facts now unknown, we are forced to the conclusion that any differential that exists in the southern climate is so slight that it cannot be proved by any of the biological criteria applied to the acclimatization of white races in the tropics. This is not to deny that man is forced to habituate himself to the southern climate, but to point out that such habituation is more a matter of personal routine and culture. The great test of biological adjustment must remain that of racial survival. This is a test the South meets without difficulty. . . .

The architecture that has come to be associated

with the planter South is a notable achievement in adjustment to weather—one of the finest worked out on our continent. The verandas, the wide high porches, set off by white columns, and the high ceilings did more than achieve a type of beauty. They protected the house from beating rains but more than that they shaded it from the sun's slanting rays. What if the hound dog, the cat, and the southern colonel with his mint julep followed the shade around the veranda. The invasion of the South by an architecture without porches is distinctly a step backward. The sun again becomes an enemy by heating the house too much during the day for pleasant sleep at night, and southern summer rains necessitate the

closing of windows during periods of greatest humidity. . . .

The midday siesta in the lower South has seemed as indigenous to the southern summer as to its Mediterranean home. In its humblest form it may be viewed in August noons on the front porch of Negro cabins in the Delta. In its higher reaches the siesta was once enjoyed by dignified business men of Charleston, Savannah, and New Orleans. In all three cities time has been when no business could be transacted with any figures of prominence for two or three hours after noon. Closely related are the cooling drinks and light clothing. Children can go barefooted in such a clime either from choice or necessity.

B.

PEOPLE

Climate is an aspect—in fact, the one unmodified aspect—of environment. As such it is a predetermining factor in social development. But the record of history is in one way or another a record of man, and no environmental forces can create sectional distinctions except as they act upon man. The question arises, therefore, whether the human population of one area diverged from that of another in ways that would justify regarding the areas as separate sections. This inquiry leads soon enough to subtle questions about personality, ideals, and attitudes, but it can be approached by a much more basic examination of the extent to which a population fills up its area (the ratio of man to land), of the fashion in which it is distributed over the area, and of the proportions of the population which are engaged in various major types of occupation. All these can be measured with extreme accuracy and have the most far-reaching implications for the economic advancement and social organization of the populations involved.

1. *Density of Population.* The following table shows the number of inhabitants per square mile of area for the states and territories of the United States in 1850.⁴ Can any generalization be made from this table about population density in the various regions? Economically, what bearing would population density have upon the development of railroads and industrial plants?

Alabama	15.21
Arkansas	4.02
California	.59
Carolina, North	17.14
Carolina, South	22.75
Columbia, District of	861.45
Connecticut	78.06
Delaware	43.18
Florida	1.48
Georgia	15.62
Illinois	15.37
Indiana	29.24
Indian Territory	[No report]
Iowa	3.78
Kentucky	26.07

Louisiana	12.55
Maine	18.36
Maryland	52.41
Massachusetts	127.50
Michigan	7.07
Minnesota Territory	.04
Mississippi	12.86
Missouri	10.12
Nebraska Terr. (proposed)	[No report]
New Hampshire	34.26
New Mexico Territory	.30
New York	65.90
New Jersey	58.84
Northwest Territory	[No report]
Ohio	49.55
Oregon Territory	.07
Pennsylvania	50.26
Rhode Island	112.97
Tennessee	21.99
Texas	.89
Utah Territory	.04
Virginia	23.17
Vermont	30.76
Wisconsin	5.66
Average United States	7.90

2. *Cities in the United States.* An important tendency in the population growth was the increasing proportion of people who lived in cities. In 1790 there were only five cities in the United States with more than 10,000 population (these were Philadelphia, 42,000, New York, 33,000, Boston, 18,000, Charleston, 16,000, and Baltimore, 13,000), and the percentages of population living in places of 8000 or more was but 3.3 percent. By 1830 this proportion had increased to 7.5 percent, and by 1850 to 15.7 percent. The tendency toward urbanization did not operate uniformly throughout the country, however, as the following table will show.⁵ This lists all the cities of more than 10,000 population in 1850. If the alphabetical listing should be discarded and the cities arranged instead according to geographical location, could any generalization be made that would involve a contrast between North, South, and West?

Albany, N. Y.	50,763	Lancaster, Pa.	12,369
Allegheny, Pa.	21,262	Lockport, N. Y.	12,323
Augusta, Ga.	11,753	Louisville, Ky.	43,194
Baltimore, Md.	169,054	Lowell, Mass.	33,383
Bangor, Me.	14,432	Lynn, Mass.	14,257
Boston, Mass.	136,881	Manchester, N. H.	13,932
Brooklyn, N. Y.	96,838	Milwaukee City, Wis.	20,061
Buffalo, N. Y.	42,261	Mobile, Ala.	20,515
Cambridge, Mass.	15,215	Nashville, Tenn.	10,165
Charleston, S. C.	42,985	Newark City, N. J.	38,894
Charlestown, Mass.	17,216	New Bedford, Mass.	16,443
Chicago, Ill.	29,963	New Brunswick, N. J.	10,019
Cincinnati, O.	115,436	Newburg, N. Y.	11,415
Cleveland, O.	17,034	New Haven, Conn.	20,345
Columbus, O.	17,882	New Orleans, La.	116,375
Dayton, O.	10,977	New York, N. Y.	515,547
Detroit City, Mich.	21,019	Norfolk, Va.	14,326
Fall River, Mass.	11,524	Norwich, Conn.	10,265
Hartford, Conn.	13,555	Oswego City, N. Y.	12,205
Kingston, N. Y.	10,232	Paterson, N. J.	11,334
La Fayette, La.	14,190	Petersburg, Va.	14,010
		Philadelphia, Pa.	340,045
		Pittsburg, Pa.	46,601
		Portland, Me.	20,815
		Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	13,944
		Providence, R. I.	41,513
		Reading, Pa.	15,743
		Richmond, Va.	27,570
		Rochester, N. Y.	36,403
		Roxbury, Mass.	18,364
		St. Louis, Mo.	77,860
		Salem, Mass.	20,264
		Savannah, Ga.	15,312
		Smithfield, R. I.	11,500
		Springfield, Mass.	11,766
		Syracuse, N. Y.	22,271
		Taunton, Mass.	10,441
		Troy, N. Y.	28,785
		Utica, N. Y.	17,565
		Washington, D. C.	40,001
		Wheeling, Va.	11,435
		Wilmington, Del.	13,979
		Worcester, Mass.	17,049

3. *Economic Employment of the American People.* According to the Census of 1840, there were 4,796,407 workers, slave and free, in the United States. These were classified in seven groups: agriculture, manufacturing, commerce, mining, ocean navigation, internal navigation, and learned professions. The great bulk, however, were in the agricultural and manufacturing groups; in fact, 4,509,000

of the people listed fell into one of these two groups. The following table shows by states the numbers engaged in these two major occupations.⁶ What is the smallest proportion of workers in manufacture in any New England or Middle Atlantic state? What is the highest proportion in any southern or southwestern state? What generalization follows?

	Agriculture	Manufactures
Maine	101,630	21,879
New Hampshire	77,949	17,826
Vermont	73,150	13,174
Massachusetts	87,837	85,176
Rhode Island	16,617	21,271
Connecticut	56,955	27,932
New England states	414,138	187,258
New York	455,954	173,193
New Jersey	56,701	27,004
Pennsylvania	207,533	105,883
Delaware	16,015	4,060
Maryland	69,851	21,325
District of Columbia	384	2,278
Middle states	806,438	333,743
Virginia	318,771	54,147
North Carolina	217,695	14,322
South Carolina	198,363	10,325
Georgia	209,383	7,984
Florida	12,117	1,177
Southern states	955,729	87,955
Alabama	177,439	7,195
Mississippi	139,724	4,151
Louisiana	79,289	7,565
Arkansas	26,355	1,173
Tennessee	227,739	17,815
Southwestern states	650,546	37,899
Missouri	92,408	11,100
Kentucky	197,738	23,217
Ohio	272,579	66,265
Indiana	148,806	20,590
Illinois	105,337	13,185
Michigan	56,521	6,890
Iowa	10,469	1,629
Wisconsin	7,047	1,814
Northwestern states	890,905	144,690
Total	3,717,756	791,545

4. *Geographical Distribution of Wealth.* In 1860 Thomas P. Kettell made a summary and comparison of the economic progress of the northern, western, and southern states. (In the northern group he included New England, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania; in the western, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, California and the territories; in the southern, all states

south of the Mason-Dixon Line or the Ohio River and extending through Texas.) In his summary which follows it should be observed that the southern valuation of personal estate included slaves and that the northern valuation of agricultural products included hay, which the South did not have to produce in any quantity since it could forage its animals out of doors most of the year.⁷

	North	West	South	Total
White population	8,626,852	4,900,368	6,222,418	19,749,638
<i>Production</i>				
White hands in agriculture	823,171	728,127	849,285	2,400,583
Area, acres	102,878,080	917,315,240	538,533,120	1,558,926,440
Product agriculture	\$295,568,699	\$246,097,028	\$528,571,103	\$1,070,236,830
Hands in manufacture	684,761	122,354	151,944	959,069
Cotton manufacture	\$52,062,953	\$438,900	\$9,367,331	\$61,869,184
Total "	715,846,142	138,780,537	164,579,937	1,019,106,616
Exports	\$78,217,202	\$198,389,351	\$278,392,080
Tonnage	3,481,436	373,661	918,092	4,773,189
Railroads, miles	8,685	10,706	8,171	27,562
<i>Property</i>				
Value of animals	\$173,812,690	\$112,563,851	\$253,795,330	\$538,171,871
Capital in manufacture	382,366,732	155,883,045	94,995,674	533,245,822
Value of tonnage	17,407,180	1,868,305	4,590,460	23,865,945
" railroads	451,949,410	298,837,647	221,857,503	972,644,560
" bank capital	186,668,462	16,978,130	97,730,579	301,376,071
" private "	94,545,000	13,204,711	10,286,369	118,036,080
Real estate	1,835,063,613	619,154,287	1,445,008,447	3,899,226,347
Personal estate	544,718,966	195,054,073	1,385,727,523	2,125,440,562
Total	\$3,688,532,053	\$1,413,544,049	\$3,514,074,185	\$8,616,150,287

Part II.

SOCIAL PATTERNS OF THE NORTH

The selections in Part I have shown some significant points of variation between different states or regions of the United States, but statistics cannot explain the way of life of a community or the personality traits of its members. In fact, these can never be fully re-captured, even in the case of a static and homogeneous society, much less in one marked by rapid change and diverse conditions within its own limits. Nevertheless the student of sectionalism and nationalism must base his conclusions upon a comparison between patterns of life in various parts of the country, and for this purpose he must rely on the records made by residents or travelers. Such records exist with varying degrees of value for North, South, and West, and this Problem and the one following will give a sampling of all three, beginning with the North.

The North was particularly difficult to characterize, both because of the rapidity with which it changed and because of the relatively greater complexity of its social and economic structure. At the beginning of the republic, the states north of Maryland had possessed a population scarcely larger than that of the southern states, and they had been overwhelmingly agricultural in their economic activity, though the coastal regions of New England also engaged heavily in shipbuilding and fishing and in ocean-borne commerce in which Philadelphia and New York were also active. By 1860, however, the population of the New England and Middle Atlantic states had increased from 2,026,000 to 10,706,000; industry had grown to overshadow agriculture in the value of its product if not in the numbers of people which it occupied, and foreign commerce had sunk to a position of relative unimportance compared with domestic trade. Even agriculture had undergone a revolution as new regions farther west began to dominate the grain markets and eastern farmers turned

increasingly to truck farming, dairy farming, and other forms of diversified agriculture. As a natural accompaniment of these changes the old rural society was now varied by the presence of numerous large cities.

Thus there was no typical northern way of life, for the resident of New York or New England might be a farmer, a factory worker, or a dweller in one of the teeming cities which were growing so rapidly in the northeast.

1. *New England Farm Life.* Before centers of commerce and industry became important in the North, the one generally prevalent social unit was the one-family farm. Later, when agriculture ceased to be the major source of wealth, it still provided a way of life for the bulk of the people. One farm dweller who left an account of rural life in the early part of the nineteenth century was Sarah Anna Emery of Massachusetts. Her account of her girlhood on her grandfather's farm near Haverhill provides numerous details which enable one to form an impression about the industriousness of the people, the diversity of their activities, the strength of family and community ties, the importance of religion, and the attitude toward leisure and luxury.⁸

At my grandfather Little's, three daughters, Betsy, Sukey, and Hannah, and the three sons still remained under the paternal roof; there were also three young men, apprentices, learning the trade of a shoemaker. Grandfather at that time carried on a brisk business, as business was reckoned in those days, in a shop near the dwelling—this, and the care of a good sized farm, kept every one busy. Family worship and breakfast over, the "men folks" went to their labor, and grandmam' and the girls began the day's routine. The two youngest girls assisting alternately week by week in the housework and spinning. The weaving was usually put out to some neighboring woman, though sometimes an assistant was hired to weave at the house for a few weeks. In the cold weather, the morning work finished, and the dinner put over the fire to boil, grandmam', would seat herself by the window with her basket, and call me to a stool by her side, where I industriously stitched through the day, now and then recreating with a run to the chamber where my aunt, unless the weather was very severe, usually spun, or to the shop or barn with Uncle Joe, my boy uncle, a great rogue, but my very best friend and crony. Company often came of an afternoon, for though my grandmother seldom visited, she was "given to hospitality," and the neighbors, relatives and town's folks fully appreciated and enjoyed the attractions of her house and tea table.

At dark my work was laid aside. Uncle Joe and I occupied the form in the chimney corner of an evening, cracking nuts, parching corn in the ashes with a crooked stick, roasting apples and telling stories or riddles, or playing fox and geese on a

board, chalked for the game, with a red kernel of corn for the fox and yellow for geese.

At nine o'clock grandsir and the young men came. Grandsir would seat himself in his arm-chair, before the fire to toast his feet, grandmam' lay aside her knitting and draw her low one to the corner beside our form. The nuts, corn and apples were passed round, and sometimes a mug of flip was made. After all had become warmed and refreshed, the Bible was laid on the stand, a fresh candle lighted, and the old gentleman reverently read a chapter, then a lengthy prayer was offered, through which we all stood with heads bowed devoutly, though I am sorry to say that grandmam's thoughts were sometimes called to this mundane sphere, by that incorrigible Joe, and her low "sh" could often be detected, as she thwarted some mischief, or prevented some prank, played with the dire intent of making me laugh. With the warmer weather Aunt Betsy transferred our work to her chamber, where it escaped the espionage of the curious eyes and gossiping tongues that during the winter had at times been excessively annoying; but in the long, bright June afternoons I used to steal down to the front entry; seated upon the sill of the open door, my fingers kept time to the murmur of the brook or the song of the birds in the willows bordering the silvery stream just beyond the gravel path, edged by flowers, the perfume of which, mingling with that of the lilacs and sweet briar, filled the air with grateful odor. Grandmam' took great pleasure in her flowers. Though sister Noyes "could not see how she found time for sich fiddle-de-dees," and brother John's wife pronounced "sich things all vanity," and other wise people thought it would be better to raise something useful, granmam' continued to cultivate her garden to the end of her long life.

2. *More Farm Life.* Another description of New England farm life at the beginning of the nineteenth century appears in the boyhood memories of Samuel G. Goodrich, author and publisher of the "Peter Parley" books, who was reared near Ridgefield, Connecticut.⁹

Yet despite the somewhat forbidding nature of the soil and climate of Ridgefield, it may be regarded as presenting a favorable example of New England country life and society, at the beginning of the present century. The town was originally settled by a sturdy race of men, mostly

the immediate descendants of English emigrants, some from Norwalk and some from Milford. Their migration over an intervening space of savage hills, rocks, and ravines, into a territory so forbidding, and their speedy conversion of this into a thriving and smiling village, are witnesses to their courage and energy.

Nearly all the inhabitants of Ridgefield were farmers, with the few mechanics that were necessary to carry on society in a somewhat primeval state. Even the persons not professionally devoted to agriculture, had each his farm, or at least his garden and home lot, with his pigs, poultry, and cattle. The population might have been 1200, comprising two hundred families. All could read and write, but in point of fact, beyond the *Almanac* and Watts' *Psalms and Hymns*, their literary acquirements had little scope. There were, I think, four newspapers, all weekly, published in the State: one at Hartford, one at New London, one at New Haven, and one at Litchfield. There were, however, not more than three subscribers to all these in our village. We had, however, a public library of some two hundred volumes, and what was of equal consequence—the town was on the road which was then the great thoroughfare, connecting Boston with New York, and hence it had means of intelligence from travelers constantly passing through the place, which kept it up with the march of events. . . .

I must not fail to give you a portrait of one of our village homes—of the middle class—at this era. I take as an example that of our neighbor, J. . . . B. . . . who had been a tailor, but having thriven in his affairs, and now advanced to the age of some fifty years, had become a farmer—such a career, by the way, being common at the time; for the prudent mechanic, adding to his house and his lands, as his necessities and his thrift dictated, usually ended as the proprietor of an ample house, fifty to a hundred acres of land, and an ample barn, stocked with half a dozen cows, one or two horses, a flock of sheep, and a general assortment of poultry.

The home of this, our neighbor B. . . . , was situated on the road leading to Salem, there being a wide space in front occupied by the wood-pile, which in these days was not only a matter of great importance, but of formidable bulk. The size of the wood-pile was indeed in some sort an index to the rank and condition of the proprietor. The house itself was a low edifice, forty feet long, and of two stories in front; the rear being what was called a *breakback*, that is, sloping down to a height of ten feet; this low part furnishing a shelter for garden tools, and various household instruments. The whole was constructed of wood; the outside being of the dun complexion assumed by unpainted wood, exposed to the weather for twenty or thirty years, save only that the roof was

tinged of a reddish-brown by a fine moss that found sustenance in the chestnut shingles.

To the left was the garden, which in the productive season was a wilderness of onions, squashes, cucumbers, beets, parsnips, and currants, with the never-failing tansey for bitters, horseradish for seasoning, and fennel for keeping old women awake in church time. A sprig of fennel was in fact the theological smelling-bottle of the tender sex, and not unfrequently of the men, who, from long sitting in the sanctuary—after a week of labor in the field—found themselves too strongly tempted to visit the forbidden land of Nod—would sometimes borrow a sprig of fennel, and exorcise the fiend that threatened their spiritual welfare.

The interior of the house presented a parlor with plain, whitewashed walls, a home-made carpet upon the floor, calico curtains at the window, and a mirror three feet by two against the side, with a mahogany frame: to these must be added eight chairs and a cherry table, of the manufacture of Deacon Hawley. The keeping or sitting room had also a carpet, a dozen rush-bottom chairs, a table, &c. The kitchen was large—fully twenty feet square, with a fireplace six feet wide and four feet deep. On one side, it looked out upon the garden, the squashes and cucumbers climbing up and forming festoons over the door; on the other a view was presented of the orchard, embracing first a circle of peaches, pears, and plums, and beyond, a wide-spread clover field, embowered with apple-trees. Just by, was the well, with its tall sweep, the old oaken bucket dangling from the pole. The kitchen was in fact the most comfortable room in the house; cool in summer, and perfumed with the breath of the garden and the orchard; in winter, with its roaring blaze of hickory, it was a cosy resort, defying the bitterest blasts of the season. Here the whole family assembled at meals, save only when the presence of company made it proper to serve tea in the parlor.

The chambers were all without carpets, and the furniture was generally of a simple character. The beds, however, were of ample size, and well filled with geese feathers, these being deemed essential for comfortable people. I must say, by the way, that every decent family had its flock of geese, of course, which was picked thrice a year, despite the noisy remonstrances of both goose and gander. The sheets of the bed, though of home-made linen, were as white as the driven snow. Indeed, the beds of this era showed that sleep was a luxury, well understood and duly cherished by all classes. The cellar, extending under the whole house, was a vast receptacle, and by no means the least important part of the establishment. In the autumn, it was supplied with three barrels of beef and as many of pork, twenty barrels of cider, with numerous bins of potatoes,

turnips, beets, carrots, and cabbages. The garret, which was of huge dimensions, at the same time displayed a labyrinth of dried pumpkins, peaches, and apples—hung in festoons upon the rafters, amid bunches of summer savory, boneset, fennel, and other herbs—the floor being occupied by heaps of wool; flax, tow, and the like.

The barn corresponded to the house. It was a low brown structure, having abundance of sheds built on to it, without the least regard to symmetry. I need not say it was well stocked with hay, oats, rye, and buckwheat. Six cows, one or two horses, three dozen sheep, and an ample supply of poultry, including two or three broods of turkeys, constituted its living tenants. . . .

In most families, the first exercise of the morning was reading the Bible, followed by a prayer, at which all were assembled, including the servants and helpers of the kitchen and the farm. Then came the breakfast, which was a substantial meal, always including hot viands, with vegetables, apple-sauce, pickles, mustard, horseradish, and various other condiments. Cider was the common drink for laboring people; even children drank it at will. Tea was common, but not so general as now. Coffee was almost unknown. Dinner was a still more hearty and varied repast—characterized by abundance of garden vegetables; tea was a light supper.

The day began early: breakfast was had at six in summer and seven in winter; dinner at noon—the work people in the fields being called to their meals by a conch-shell, usually winded by some kitchen Triton. The echoing of the noon-tide horn, from farm to farm, and over hill and dale, was a species of music which even rivaled the popular melody of drum and fife. Tea—the evening meal, usually took place about sundown. In families where all were laborers, all sat at table, servants as well as masters—the food being served before sitting down. In families where the masters and mistresses did not share the labors of the household or the farm, the meals of the domestics were had separate. There was, however, in those days a perfectly good understanding and good feeling between the masters and servants. Our servants, during all my early life, were of the neighborhood, generally the daughters of respectable farmers and mechanics, and respecting others, were themselves respected and cherished. They were devoted to the interests of the family, and were always relied upon and treated as friends. In health, they had the same food; in sickness, the same care as the masters and mistresses or their children. This servitude implied no degradation because it did not degrade the heart or manners of those subjected to it. It was never thought of as a reproach to a man or woman—in the stations they afterwards filled—that he or she had been out to service.

3. *Life in a Mill Town.* As Sarah Anna Emery's reminiscences have shown, there existed even in early rural New England a kind of household industry mingled with the purely agricultural pursuits. Spinning and weaving had always been household industries in England, but during the eighteenth century English inventors had devised textile machinery which could not be placed in the home, and as a result the workers were obliged to come to the machine in the mill or factory for their employment. After a time such techniques were transplanted to America. The pioneer in this development was the English spinner Samuel Slater who came to America and opened the first spinning mill in New England at Pawtucket, Rhode Island, in 1789. Slater enjoyed great success, but he never attempted to combine the spinning and weaving processes in a single factory, and it remained for Francis C. Lowell to do so in 1814 at Waltham, Massachusetts. Other factories were soon built at Lowell and elsewhere along the Merrimac and textiles became the first important American industry. These factories attracted much attention, and a number of travelers wrote accounts of them. One of these observers was the Englishwoman Harriet Martineau, who visited them in 1836. Miss Martineau also visited mills in New Jersey, and at Lynn, Massachusetts, she inspected another type of industry, shoe manufacturing, which was conducted on quite a different basis.¹⁰

It has been shown that domestic manufactures were carried on to a great extent, so far back as 1790. From that time to this, they have never altogether ceased in the farm-houses, as the home-spun, still so frequently to be seen all over the country, and the agricultural meetings of New England, (where there is usually a display of domestic manufactures,) will testify. The hands by which these products are wrought come to the factories, when the demand for labour renders it worth while; and drop back into the farm-houses when the demand slackens.

It is not the custom in America for women (except slaves) to work out of doors. It has been mentioned that the young men of New England migrate in large numbers to the west, leaving an over-proportion of female population, the amount of which I could never learn. Statements were made to me; but so incredible that I withhold them. Suffice it that there are many more women than men in from six to nine States of the Union. There is reason to believe that there was much silent suffering from poverty before the institution of factories; that they afford a most welcome resource to some thousands of young women, unwilling to give themselves to domestic service, and

precluded, by the customs of the country, from rural labour. We have seen how large a proportion of the labour in the Lowell factories is supplied by women.

Much of the rest is furnished by immigrants. I saw English, Irish, and Scotch operatives. I heard but a poor character of the English operatives; and the Scotch were pronounced "ten times better." The English are jealous of their 'bargain,' and on the watch lest they should be asked to do more than they stipulated for: their habits are not so sober as those of the Scotch, and they are incapable of going beyond the single operation they profess. Such is the testimony of their employers. . . .

The first cotton-mill that I saw was at Paterson, New Jersey. It was set up at first with nine hundred spindles, which were afterwards increased to fifteen hundred; then to six thousand. Building was still going on when I was there. The girls were all well-dressed. Their hair was arranged according to the latest fashions which had arrived, via New York, and they wore calashes in going to and fro between their dwellings and the mill. . . .

I visited the corporate factory-establishment at Waltham, within a few miles of Boston. The Waltham Mills were at work before those of Lowell were set up. The establishment is for the spinning and weaving of cotton alone, and the construction of the requisite machinery. Five hundred persons were employed at the time of my visit. The girls earn two, and some three, dollars a-week, besides their board. The little children earn one dollar a-week. Most of the girls live in the houses provided by the corporation, which accommodate from six to eight each. When sisters come to the mill, it is a common practice for them to bring their mother to keep house for them and some of their companions, in a dwelling built by their own earnings. In this case, they save enough out of their board to clothe themselves, and have their two or three dollars a-week to spare. Some have thus cleared off mortgages from their fathers' farms; others have educated the hope of the family at college; and many are rapidly accumulating an independence. I saw a whole street of houses built with the earnings of the girls; some with piazzas, and green venetian blinds; and all neat and sufficiently spacious.

The factory people built the church, which stands conspicuous on the green in the midst of the place. The minister's salary (eight hundred dollars last year) is raised by a tax on the pews. The corporation gave them a building for a lyceum, which they have furnished with a good library, and where they have lectures every winter, — the best that money can procure. The girls have, in many instances, private libraries of some merit and value.

The managers of the various factory establish-

ments keep the wages as nearly equal as possible, and then let the girls freely shift about from one to another. When a girl comes to the overseer to inform him of her intention of working at the mill, he welcomes her, and asks how long she means to stay. It may be six months, or a year, or five years, or for life. She declares what she considers herself fit for, and sets to work accordingly. If she finds that she cannot work so as to keep up with the companion appointed to her, or to please her employer or herself, she comes to the overseer, and volunteers to pick cotton, or sweep the rooms, or undertake some other service that she can perform.

The people work about seventy hours per week, on the average. The time of work varies with the length of the days, the wages continuing the same. All look like well-dressed young ladies. The health is good; or rather, (as this is too much to be said about health any where in the United States,) it is no worse than it is elsewhere. . . .

The shoe-making at Lynn is carried on almost entirely in private dwellings, from the circumstance that the people who do it are almost all farmers or fishermen likewise. A stranger who has not been enlightened upon the ways of the place would be astonished at the number of small square erections, like miniature schoolhouses, standing each as an appendage to a dwelling-house. These are the "shoe shops," where the father of the family and his boys work, while the women within are employed in binding and trimming. Thirty or more of these shoe-shops may be counted in a walk of half-a-mile. When a Lynn shoe manufacturer receives an order, he issues the tidings. The leather is cut out by men on his premises; and then the work is given to those who apply for it; if possible, in small quantities, for the sake of dispatch. The shoes are brought home on Friday night, packed off on Saturday, and in a fortnight or three weeks are on the feet of dwellers in all parts of the Union. The whole family works upon shoes during the winter; and in the summer, the father and sons turn out into the fields, or go fishing. I knew of an instance where a little boy and girl maintained the whole family, while the earnings of the rest went to build a house. I saw very few shabby houses. Quakers are numerous in Lynn. The place is unboundedly prosperous, through the temperance and industry of the people. The deposits in the Lynn Savings' Bank in 1834, were about 34,000 dollars, the population of the town being then 4,000. Since that time, both the population and the prosperity have much increased. It must be remembered, too, that the mechanics of America have more uses for their money than are open to the operatives of England. They build houses, buy land, and educate their sons and daughters.

4. *An Adverse Report.* Not all accounts of conditions at Lowell were so glowing as Miss

Martineau's. Among those who viewed the new industrialism with dismay were a group of followers of the Utopian Socialist Fourier. One of these Associationists, as they called themselves, wrote for his group's journal, *The Harbinger*, an account of a visit to Lowell in 1846.¹¹

We have lately visited the cities of Lowell and Manchester, and have had an opportunity of examining the factory system more closely than before. We had distrusted the accounts, which we had heard from persons engaged in the Labor Reform, now beginning to agitate New England; we could scarcely credit the statements made in relation to the exhausting nature of the labor in the mills, and to the manner in which the young women, the operatives, lived in their boarding-houses, six sleeping in a room, poorly ventilated.

We went through many of the mills, talked particularly to a large number of the operatives, and ate at their boarding-houses, on purpose to ascertain by personal inspection the facts of the case. We assure our readers that very little information is possessed, and no correct judgments formed, by the public at large, of our factory system, which is the first germ of the Industrial or Commercial Feudalism, that is to spread over our land. . . .

In Lowell live between seven and eight thousand young women, who are generally daughters of farmers of the different States of New England; some of them are members of families that were rich the generation before. . . .

The operatives work thirteen hours a day in the summer time, and from daylight to dark in the winter. At half past four in the morning the factory bell rings, and at five the girls must be in the mills. A clerk, placed as a watch, observes those who are a few minutes behind the time, and effectual means are taken to stimulate to punctuality. This is the morning commencement of the industrial discipline—(should we not rather say industrial tyranny?) which is established in these Associations of this moral and Christian community. At seven the girls are allowed thirty minutes for breakfast, and at noon thirty minutes more for dinner, except during the first quarter of the year, when the time is extended to forty-five minutes. But within this time they must hurry to their boarding-houses and return to the factory, and that through the hot sun, or the rain and cold. A meal eaten under such circumstances must be quite unfavorable to digestion and health, as any medical man will inform us. At seven o'clock in the evening the factory bell sounds the close of the day's work.

Thus thirteen hours per day of close attention and monotonous labor are exacted from the young women in these manufactories. . . . So fatigued—we should say, exhausted and worn out, but we

wish to speak of the system in the simplest language—are numbers of the girls, that they go to bed soon after their evening meal, and endeavor by a comparatively long sleep to resuscitate their weakened frames for the toils of the coming day. When Capital has got thirteen hours of labor daily out of a being, it can get nothing more. It would be a poor speculation in an industrial point of view to own the operative; for the trouble and expense of providing for times of sickness and old age would more than counterbalance the difference between the price of wages and the expense of board and clothing. The far greater number of fortunes, accumulated by the North in comparison with the South, shows that hiring labor is more profitable for Capital than slave labor.

Now let us examine the nature of the labor itself, and the conditions under which it is performed. Enter with us into the large rooms, when the looms are at work. The largest that we saw is in the Amoskeag Mills at Manchester. It is four hundred feet long, and about seventy broad; there are five hundred looms, and twenty-one thousand spindles in it. The din and clatter of these five hundred looms under full operation, struck us on first entering as something frightful and infernal, for it seemed such an atrocious violation of one of the faculties of the human soul, the sense of hearing. After a while we became somewhat inured to it, and by speaking quite close to the ear of an operative and quite loud, we could hold a conversation, and make the inquiries we wished.

The girls attend upon an average three looms; many attend four, but this requires a very active person, and the most unrelenting care. However, a great many do it. Attention to two is as much as should be demanded of an operative. This gives us some idea of the application required during the thirteen hours of daily labor. The atmosphere of such a room cannot of course be pure; on the contrary it is charged with cotton filaments and dust, which, we were told, are very injurious to the lungs. On entering the room, although the day was warm, we remarked that the windows were down; we asked the reason, and a young woman answered very naively, and without seeming to be in the least aware that this privation of fresh air was anything else than perfectly natural, that "when the wind blew, the threads did not work so well." After we had been in the room for fifteen or twenty minutes, we found ourselves, as did the persons who accompanied us, in quite a perspiration, produced by a certain moisture which we observed in the air, as well as by the heat. . . .

The young women sleep upon an average six in a room; three beds to a room. There is no privacy, no retirement here; it is almost impossible

to read or write alone, as the parlor is full and so many sleep in the same chamber. A young woman remarked to us, that if she had a letter to write, she did it on the head of a band-box, sitting on a trunk, as there was not space for a table. So live and toil the young women of our country in the boarding-houses and manufactories, which the rich and influential of our land have built for them.

5. *Industry in the American Economy.* The figures on page 105 showed that as late as 1840 the number of workers in industry was scarcely one fifth of the number in agriculture. However, the productiveness of industry was so great that the industrial element possessed an importance out of proportion to the numerical ratio. Also, industry continued to grow more rapidly than agriculture. The place of industry as a whole in the American economy in 1860 was concisely described in the census report of that year. This report also gave a brief account of the most important single industry—textile manufacture.¹²

The returns of MANUFACTURES exhibit a most gratifying increase, and present at the same time an imposing view of the magnitude to which this branch of the national industry has attained within the last decennium.

The total value of domestic manufactures, (including fisheries and the products of the mines,) according to the Census of 1850, was \$1,019,106,616. The product of the same branches for the year ending June 1, 1860, as already ascertained in part and carefully estimated for the remainder, will reach an aggregate value of *nineteen hundred millions of dollars* (1,900,000,000.) This result exhibits an increase of *more than eighty-six* (86) *per centum in ten years!* The growth of this branch of American labor appears, therefore, to have been in much greater ratio than that of the population. Its increase has been 123 per cent. greater than that even of the white population by which it was principally produced. Assuming the total value of manufactures in 1860 to have been as already stated, the product *per capita* was in the proportion of sixty dollars and sixty-one hundredths (\$60.61) for every man, woman, and child in the Union. If to this amount were added the very large aggregate of mechanical productions below the annual value of five hundred dollars—of which no official cognizance is taken—the result would be one of startling magnitude.

The production of the immense aggregate above stated gave employment to about 1,100,000 men and 285,000 women, or one million and three hundred and eighty-five thousand persons. Each of these, on an average, maintained two and a half other individuals, making the whole number of persons supported by manufactures four millions

eight hundred and forty-seven thousand and five hundred, (4,847,500,) or nearly one-sixth of the whole population. This was exclusive of the number engaged in the production of many of the raw materials, and of food for the manufacturers; in the distribution of their products, such as merchants, clerks, draymen, mariners, the employes of railroads, expresses, and steamboats; of capitalists, various artistic and professional classes, as well as carpenters, bricklayers, painters, and the members of other mechanical trades not classed as manufacturers. It is safe to assume, then, that one-third of the whole population is supported, directly and indirectly, by manufacturing industry.

These general facts, therefore, plainly indicate that, in point of productive value, and far-reaching industrial influences alone, our manufactures are entitled to a front rank among the great interests of the country. . . .

It is a gratifying fact, shown by the official statistics, that while our older communities have greatly extended their manufactures, the younger and more purely agricultural States, and even the newest Territories, have also made rapid progress. Nor has this department of American industry been cultivated at the expense of any other. There is much reason to believe that it affords the safest guarantee of the permanency and success of every other branch. Evidence bearing upon this point is found in the manufacture of agricultural machines and implements, which is one of the branches that shows the largest increase in the period under review. There is little doubt that the province of manufactures and invention in this case has been rather to create than to follow the demand. The promptness of Americans to adopt labor-saving appliances, and the vast areas devoted to grain and other staples in the United States, have developed the mechanics of agriculture to an extent and perfection elsewhere unequalled. The adoption of machinery to the extent now common in farm and plantation labor furnishes the best assurance that the development of agriculture or manufactures to their utmost, can never again justify the old charge of antagonism between them in regard to labor, or injuriously affect either by materially modifying its cost or supply. . . .

Among the great branches of pure manufacture in the United States, that of COTTON GOODS holds the first rank in respect to the value of the product and the amount of capital employed. Aided by the possession of the raw material as a product of our own soil, and by the enterprise and ingenuity of our people, this valuable industry has grown with a rapidity almost unrivalled.

The total value of cotton goods manufactured in New England was \$80,301,535, and in the middle States \$26,272,111—an increase of 83.4 per cent. in the former, and 77.7 in the latter. The

remaining States produced to the value of \$8,564,280, making the whole production during that year \$115,137,926, against \$65,501,687, the value of this branch in 1850, or an increase in the general business of nearly 76 per centum in ten years. . . . The total production in this branch was at the rate *per capita* of \$3.69 for every individual in the Union, equivalent to 46- $\frac{1}{2}$ yards of cloth for each, at the medium price of 8 cents per yard. The average product per head in 1850 was 32 $\frac{1}{4}$ yards. The increase alone has, therefore, been at the rate of 11 yards for each person, or nearly equal to the average annual consumption *per capita* in 1830, when it was estimated to amount to twelve yards. The number of hands employed in the manufacture in 1860 was 45,315 males, and 73,605 females, an increase in the male operatives of 10,020, and in the female of 10,944 since 1850. The average product of the labor of each operative was \$969. The number of spindles was returned at 5,035,798, being an increase of 1,402,105, or 38.5 per cent. over the aggregate in 1850, which was estimated at 3,633,693.

6. *Urban Life.* In 1790 no account of American life would have needed to give much attention to cities, for only 3.3 percent of the population lived in towns of 8000 or more, and Philadelphia with 42,000, New York with 33,000, Boston with 18,000, and Charleston with 16,000 were the largest cities in the country. By 1860, however, more than 16 percent of the people lived in towns of more than 8000. New York rose to a population, including the present boroughs, of 1,174,000; Philadelphia had 565,000 inhabitants and Baltimore 212,000. Chicago had risen in twenty years from 4400 to 109,200. The city, therefore, with all its wealth and complexity had become an integral part of America. The great American city was, of course, New York, and it was described in 1862 by the English novelist Anthony Trollope, who had visited it in the previous year. Trollope attempted to describe the physical aspect of the city, to tell about some of the more important features, such as schools and department stores, and to discern the characteristic traits of mind and temperament of the New Yorkers.¹³

New York has been a leading commercial city in the world for not more than fifty or sixty years. As far as I can learn, its population at the close of the last century did not exceed 60,000, and ten years later it had not reached 100,000. In 1860 it had reached nearly 800,000 in the city of New York itself. To this number must be added the numbers of Brooklyn, Williamsburgh, and Jersey City, in order that a true conception may be had of the population of this American metropolis, seeing that those places are as much a part of

New York as Southwark is of London. By this the total will be swelled to considerably above a million. It will no doubt be admitted that this growth has been very fast, and that New York may well be proud of it. . . .

New York is built upon an island. . . . The breadth of the island does not much exceed two miles, and therefore the city is long, and not capable of extension in point of breadth. In its old days it clustered itself round about the Point, and stretched itself up from there along the quays of the two waters. The streets down in this part of the town are devious enough, twisting themselves about with delightful irregularity; but as the city grew there came the taste for parallelograms, and the upper streets are rectangular and numbered. Broadway, the street of New York with which the world is generally best acquainted, begins at the southern point of the town and goes northward through it. For some two miles and a half it walks away in a straight line, and then it turns to the left towards the Hudson, and becomes in fact a continuation of another street called the Bowery, which comes up in a devious course from the south-east extremity of the island. From that time Broadway never again takes a straight course, but crosses the various Avenues in an oblique direction till it becomes the Bloomingdale road, and under that name takes itself out of town. There are eleven so-called Avenues, which descend in absolutely straight lines from the northern, and at present unsettled, extremity of the new town, making their way southward till they lose themselves among the old streets. These are called First Avenue, Second Avenue, and so on. The town had already progressed two miles up northwards from the Battery before it had caught the parallelogrammic fever from Philadelphia, for at about that distance we find "First Street." First Street runs across the Avenues from water to water, and then Second Street. I will not name them all, seeing that they go up to 154th Street! They do so at least on the map, and I believe on the lamp-posts. But the houses are not yet built in order beyond 50th or 60th Street. The other hundred streets, each of two miles long, with the Avenues, which are mostly unoccupied for four or five miles, is the ground over which the young New Yorkers are to spread themselves. I do not in the least doubt that they will occupy it all, and that 154th Street will find itself too narrow a boundary for the population.

I have said that there was some good architectural effect in New York, and I alluded chiefly to that of the Fifth Avenue. The Fifth Avenue is the Belgrave Square, the Park Lane, and the Pall Mall of New York. It is certainly a very fine street. The houses in it are magnificent, not having that aristocratic look which some of our detached London residences enjoy, or the palatial appear-

ance of an old-fashioned hotel in Paris, but an air of comfortable luxury and commercial wealth which is not excelled by the best houses of any other town that I know. They are houses, not hotels or palaces; but they are very roomy houses, with every luxury that complete finish can give them. Many of them cover large spaces of ground, and their rent will sometimes go up as high as 800 *l.* and 1000 *l.* a year. Generally the best of these houses are owned by those who live in them, and rent is not therefore paid. But this is not always the case, and the sums named above may be taken as expressing their value. In England a man should have a very large income indeed who could afford to pay 1000 *l.* a year for his house in London. Such a one would as a matter of course have an establishment in the country, and be an Earl or a Duke or a millionaire. But it is different in New York. The resident there shows his wealth chiefly by his house, and though he may probably have a villa at Newport or a box somewhere up the Hudson he has no second establishment. Such a house therefore will not represent a total expenditure of above 4,000 *l.* a year.

There are churches on each side of Fifth Avenue,—perhaps five or six within sight at one time,—which add much to the beauty of the street. They are well-built, and in fairly good taste. These, added to the general well-being and splendour of the place, give it an effect better than the architecture of the individual houses would seem to warrant. I own that I have enjoyed the vista as I have walked up and down Fifth Avenue, and have felt that the city had a right to be proud of its wealth. But the greatness and beauty and glory of wealth have on such occasions been all in all with me. I know no great man, no celebrated statesman, no philanthropist of peculiar note who has lived in Fifth Avenue. That gentleman on the right made a million of dollars by inventing a shirt-collar; this one on the left electrified the world by a lotion; as to the gentleman at the corner there,—there are rumours about him and the Cuban slave-trade; but my informant by no means knows that they are true. Such are the aristocracy of Fifth Avenue. I can only say that if I could make a million dollars by a lotion, I should certainly be right to live in such a house as one of those.

The suburbs of New York are, by the nature of the localities, divided from the city by water. New Jersey and Hoboken are on the other side of the Hudson, and in another State. Williamsburgh and Brooklyn are in Long Island, which is a part of the State of New York. But these places are as easily reached as Lambeth is reached from Westminster. Steam ferries ply every three or four minutes, and into these boats coaches, carts and waggons of any size or weight are driven. In fact

they make no other stoppage to the commerce than that occasioned by the payment of a few cents. Such payment no doubt is a stoppage, and therefore it is that New Jersey, Brooklyn, and Williamsburgh are, at any rate in appearance, very dull and uninviting. They are, however, very populous. Many of the quieter citizens prefer to live there; and I am told that the Brooklyn tea-parties consider themselves to be, in aesthetic feeling, very much ahead of anything of the kind in the more opulent centres of the city. . . .

But the glory of New York is the Central Park;—its glory in the mind of all New Yorkers of the present day. The first question asked of you is whether you have seen the Central Park, and the second is as to what you think of it. It does not do to say simply that it is fine, grand, beautiful, and miraculous. You must swear by cock and pie that it is more fine, more grand, more beautiful, more miraculous than anything else of the kind anywhere. Here you encounter, in its most annoying form, that necessity for eulogium which presses you everywhere. For, in truth, taken as it is at present, the Central Park is not fine, nor grand, nor beautiful. As to the miracle, let that pass. It is perhaps as miraculous as some other great latter-day miracles.

. . . New York appears to me as infinitely more American than Boston, Chicago, or Washington. It has no peculiar attribute of its own, as have those three cities; Boston in its literature and accomplished intelligence, Chicago in its internal trade, and Washington in its congressional and State politics. New York has its literary aspirations, its commercial grandeur, and,—heaven knows,—it has its politics also. But these do not strike the visitor as being specially characteristic of the city. That it is pre-eminently American is its glory or its disgrace,—as men of different ways of thinking may decide upon it. Free institutions, general education, and the ascendancy of dollars are the words written on every paving-stone along Fifth Avenue, down Broadway, and up Wall Street. Every man can vote, and values the privilege. Every man can read, and uses the privilege. Every man worships the dollar, and is down before his shrine from morning to night.

. . . All men who work desire to prosper by their work, and they so desire by the nature given to them from God. Wealth and progress must go on hand in hand together, let the accidents which occasionally divide them for a time happen as often as they may. The progress of the Americans has been caused by their aptitude for money-making, and that continual kneeling at the shrine of the coined goddess has carried them across from New York to San Francisco. Men who kneel at that shrine are called on to have ready wits, and quick hands, and not a little aptitude for self-denial. The New Yorker has been true to his

dollar, because his dollar has been true to him.

But not on this account can I, nor on this account will any Englishman, reconcile himself to the savour of dollars which pervades the atmosphere of New York. The *ars celare artem* is wanting. The making of money is the work of man; but he need not take his work to bed with him, and have it ever by his side at table, amidst his family, in church, while he disports himself, as he declares his passion to the girl of his heart, in the moments of his softest bliss, and at the periods of his most solemn ceremonies. That many do so elsewhere than in New York,—in London, for instance, in Paris, among the mountains of Switzerland, and the steppes of Russia, I do not doubt. But there is generally a veil thrown over the object of the worshipper's idolatry. In New York one's ear is constantly filled with the fanatic's voice as he prays, one's eyes are always on the familiar altar. The frankincense from the temple is ever in one's nostrils. I have never walked down Fifth Avenue alone without thinking of money. I have never walked there with a companion without talking of it. I fancy that every man there, in order to maintain the spirit of the place, should bear on his forehead a label stating how many dollars he is worth, and that every label should be expected to assert a falsehood.

I do not think that New York has been less generous in the use of its money than other cities, or that the men of New York generally are so. Perhaps I might go farther and say that in no city has more been achieved for humanity by the munificence of its richest citizens than in New York. Its hospitals, asylums, and institutions for the relief of all ailments to which flesh is heir, are very numerous, and beyond praise in the excellence of their arrangements. And this has been achieved in a great degree by private liberality. Men in America are not as a rule anxious to leave large fortunes to their children. The millionaire when making his will very generally gives back a considerable portion of the wealth which he has made to the city in which he made it. The rich citizen is always anxious that the poor citizen shall be relieved. It is a point of honour with him to raise the character of his municipality, and to provide that the deaf and dumb, the blind, the mad, the idiots, the old, and the incurable shall have such alleviation in their misfortune as skill and kindness can afford.

Nor is the New Yorker a hugger-mugger with his money. He does not hide up his dollars in old stockings and keep rolls of gold in hidden pots. He does not even invest it where it will not grow but only produce small though sure fruit. He builds houses, he speculates largely, he spreads himself in trade to the extent of his wings,—and not seldom somewhat further. He scatters his wealth broadcast over strange fields, trusting

that it may grow with an increase of an hundred-fold, but bold to bear the loss should the strange field prove itself barren. His regret at losing his money is by no means commensurate with his desire to make it. In this there is a living spirit which to me divests the dollar-worshipping idolatry of something of its ugliness. . . .

But yet, I say again, no other American city is so intensely American as New York. It is generally considered that the inhabitants of New England, the Yankees properly so called, have the American characteristics of physiognomy in the fullest degree. The lantern jaws, the thin and lithe body, the dry face on which there has been no tint of the rose since the baby's long-clothes were first abandoned, the harsh, thick hair, the thin lips, the intelligent eyes, the sharp voice with the nasal twang—not altogether harsh, though sharp and nasal,—all these traits are supposed to belong especially to the Yankee. Perhaps it was so once, but at present they are, I think, more universally common in New York than in any other part of the States. Go to Wall Street, the front of the Astor House, and the regions about Trinity Church, and you will find them in their fullest perfection.

What circumstances of blood or food, of early habit or subsequent education, have created for the latter-day American his present physiognomy? It is as completely marked, as much his own, as is that of any race under the sun that has bred in and in for centuries. But the American owns a more mixed blood than any other race known. The chief stock is English, which is itself so mixed that no man can trace its ramifications. With this are mingled the bloods of Ireland, Holland, France, Sweden, and Germany. All this has been done within but a few years, so that the American may be said to have no claim to any national type of face. Nevertheless, no man has a type of face so clearly national as the American. He is acknowledged by it all over the continent of Europe, and on his own side of the water is gratified by knowing that he is never mistaken for his English visitor. I think it comes from the hot-air pipes and from dollar worship. In the Jesuit his mode of dealing with things divine has given a peculiar cast of countenance; and why should not the American be similarly moulded by his special aspirations? As to the hot-air pipes, there can, I think, be no doubt that to them is to be charged the murder of all rosy cheeks throughout the States. If the effect was to be noticed simply in the dry faces of the men about Wall Street, I should be very indifferent to the matter. But the young ladies of Fifth Avenue are in the same category. The very pith and marrow of life is baked out of their young bones by the hot-air chambers to which they are accustomed. Hot air is the great destroyer of American beauty. . . .

"Have you seen any of our great institootions, sir?" That of course is a question, which is put to every Englishman who has visited New York, and the Englishman who intends to say that he has seen New York, should visit many of them. I went to schools, hospitals, lunatic asylums, institutes for deaf and dumb, water works, historical societies, telegraph offices, and large commercial establishments. I rather think that I did my work in a thorough and conscientious manner, and I owe much gratitude to those who guided me on such occasions. Perhaps I ought to describe all these institutions; but were I to do so, I fear that I should inflict fifty or sixty very dull pages on my readers. . . .

In all such matters, however, New York is pre-eminently great. All through the States suffering humanity receives so much attention that humanity can hardly be said to suffer. The daily recurring boast of "our glorious institootions, sir," always provokes the ridicule of an Englishman. The words have become ridiculous, and it would, I think, be well for the nation if the term "Instituition" could be excluded from its vocabulary. But, in truth, they are glorious. The country in this respect boasts, but it has done that which justifies a boast. The arrangements for supplying New York with water are magnificent. The drainage of the new part of the city is excellent. The hospitals are almost alluring. The lunatic asylum which I saw was perfect,—though I did not feel obliged to the resident physician for introducing me to all the worst patients as countrymen of my own. "An English lady, Mr. Trollope. I'll introduce you. Quite a hopeless case. Two old women. They've been here fifty years. They're English. Another gentleman from England, Mr. Trollope. A very interesting case! Confirmed inebriety."

And as to the schools, it is almost impossible to mention them with too high a praise. I am speaking here specially of New York, though I might say the same of Boston, or of all New England. I do not know any contrast that would be more surprising to an Englishman, up to that moment ignorant of the matter, than that which he would find by visiting first of all a free school in London, and then a free school in New York. If he would also learn the number of children that are educated gratuitously in each of the two cities, and also the number in each which altogether lack education, he would, if susceptible of statistics, be surprised also at that. But seeing and hearing are always more effective than mere figures. The female pupil at a free school in London is, as a rule, either a ragged pauper, or a charity girl, if not degraded at least stigmatized by the badges and dress of the Charity. We Englishmen know well the type of each, and have a fairly correct idea of the amount of education which is im-

parted to them. We see the result afterwards when the same girls become our servants, and the wives of our grooms and porters. The female pupil at a free school in New York is neither a pauper nor a charity girl. She is dressed with the utmost decency. She is perfectly cleanly. In speaking to her, you cannot in any degree guess whether her father has a dollar a day, or three thousand dollars a year. Nor will you be enabled to guess by the manner in which her associates treat her. As regards her own manner to you, it is always the same as though her father were in all respects your equal. As to the amount of her knowledge, I fairly confess that it is terrific. When, in the first room which I visited, a slight slim creature was had up before me to explain to me the properties of the hypothenuse I fairly confess that, as regards education, I backed down, and that I resolved to confine my criticisms to manner, dress, and general behaviour. In the next room I was more at my ease, finding that ancient Roman history was on the tapis. "Why did the Romans run away with the Sabine women?" asked the mistress, herself a pretty woman of about three-and-twenty. "Because they were pretty," simpered out a little girl with a cherry mouth. The answer did not give complete satisfaction; and then followed a somewhat abstruse explanation on the subject of population. It was all done with good faith and a serious intent, and showed what it was intended to show,—that the girls there educated had in truth reached the consideration of important subjects, and that they were leagues beyond that terrible repetition of A B C, to which, I fear, that most of our free metropolitan schools are still necessarily confined. You and I, reader, were we called on to superintend the education of girls of sixteen, might not select as favourite points either the hypothenuse, or the ancient methods of populating young colonies. There may be, and to us on the European side of the Atlantic there will be, a certain amount of absurdity in the transatlantic idea that all knowledge is knowledge, and that it should be imparted if it be not knowledge of evil. But as to the general result, no fair-minded man or woman can have a doubt. That the lads and girls in these schools are excellently educated comes home as a fact to the mind of any one who will look into the subject. . . .

In order to make a comparison between the schools of London and those of New York, I have called them both free schools. They are in fact more free in New York than they are in London, because in New York every boy and girl, let his parentage be what it may, can attend these schools without any payment. Thus an education as good as the American mind can compass, prepared with every care, carried on by highly paid tutors, under ample surveillance, provided with all that

is most excellent in the way of rooms, desks, books, charts, maps, and implements, is brought actually within the reach of everybody. . . .

In England a taste for very large shops has come up during the last twenty years. A firm is not doing a good business, or at any rate a distinguished business, unless he can assert in his trade card that he occupies at least half a dozen houses—Nos. 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, and 110. The old way of paying for what you want over the counter is gone; and when you buy a yard of tape or a new carriage,—for either of which articles you will probably visit the same establishment,—you go through about the same amount of ceremony as when you sell a thousand pounds out of the stocks in *propria persona*. But all this is still further exaggerated in New York. Mr. Stewart's store

there is perhaps the handsomest institution in the city, and his hall of audience for new carpets is a magnificent saloon. "You have nothing like that in England," my friend said to me as he walked me through it in triumph. "I wish we had nothing approaching to it," I answered. For I confess to a liking for the old-fashioned private shops. Harper's establishment for the manufacture and sale of books is also very wonderful. Everything is done on the premises, down to the very colouring of the paper which lines the covers, and places the gilding on their backs. The firm prints, engraves, electroplates, sews, binds, publishes, and sells wholesale and retail. I have no doubt that the authors have rooms in the attics where the other slight initiatory step is taken towards the production of literature.

Part III.

SOCIAL PATTERNS OF THE WEST

One of the great factors in American history was the steady advance of population westward. During the colonial period this westward thrust had scarcely penetrated beyond the Appalachians. In the first seventy years of the republic, however, population poured down the Ohio or through the passes in the southern mountains and began to fill up the world's finest river basin, the Mississippi Valley. By 1860, more than a third of the population lived in states which had been virtually unsettled seventy years earlier. This vast new region derived its population largely from the older states, but as Turner remarks, neither the Old Northwest nor the Old Southwest "was a mere emanation from the Eastern states; both possessed a marked Western quality and an individuality; but the presence of the Negro slave, as well as climatic and geographic conditions and differences in the colonizing stocks [from New England and the South Atlantic states respectively] made it clear . . . that the upper and lower halves of the Mississippi Valley were to be in conflict over the type of society to be developed in that vast geographic area. . . . Each great area was evolving in its own way. Each had its own type of people, its own geographic and economic basis, its own particular economic and social interests."

The distinctive features of the West were in part permanent and in part temporary. In so far as life was adjusted, for instance, to prairie rather than forest conditions, the variation was likely to be lasting; in so far as "western" customs and traits were merely responses to frontier conditions, they would tend to fade away, and the West would become less distinctive as a complex society with cities, wealth, railroads, division of labor, and fully developed institutions replaced the simple, undifferentiated society of the pioneer farmer. In examining the following selections which illustrate various aspects of western life, the student will find it useful to question to what extent they depict a distinctive regional identity and to what extent a phase or stage of advancement. Is the difference which they indicate one of place or time? Where the conditions described are only temporary, will they produce lasting traits of regional character?

A.

TYPES OF SETTLERS IN THE WEST

In the waves of migration to the West it was possible to distinguish a certain characteristic sequence. The first men to penetrate any given area were likely to be hunters and trappers. After these came a succession, somewhat overlapping of course, of various classes of settlers. The four selections following contain, first, an analysis of three classes of settlers and, then, descriptions of individuals typical of each class. In accepting these classifications, one should remember that, in part, they define different types of men and, in part, the different stages through which one individual often passed.

1. *Classes of Settlers.* Henry Bradshaw Fearon, an English visitor for nine months in 1817, toured the United States, including the western sections, and classified the frontier population thus: ¹⁴

The interior population may . . . be divided into three classes: *First, the squatter, or man who "sets himself down" upon land which is not his own, and for which he pays nothing; cultivates a sufficient extent to supply himself and family with the necessities of life; remains until he is dissatisfied with his choice;—has realized a sufficiency to become a landowner;—or is expelled by the real proprietor. Second, the small farmer, who has recently emigrated, and has barely enough to pay the first installment for his 80 or 160 acres of two dollar land; cultivates, or what he calls improves, ten to thirty acres; raises a sufficient "feed" for his family; has the females of it employed in making or patching the wretched clothing of the whole domestic circle; is in a condition which, if compelled by legislative acts, or by external force, to endure, would be considered truly wretched; but from being his own master, having made his choice, from the having "no one to make him afraid," joined with the consciousness that, though slowly, he is regularly advancing towards wealth, the breath of complaint is seldom heard to escape from his lips. Third, the wealthy or "strong-handed" farmer, who owns from five to twelve hundred acres, has one-fourth to one-third under cultivation, of a kind superior to the former; raises live stock for the home, and Atlantic-city markets; sends beef, pork, cheese, lard, and butter to New Orleans; is perhaps a legislator, at any rate a squire (magistrate); is always a man of plain businesslike sense, though not in possession nor desirous of a very cultivated intellect; understands his own interest, and that of his country; lives in sufficient affluence, and is possessed of comfort, according to the American acceptation of the term but to which we "old country" folks must feel inclined to take an exception: but in conclusion, and a most important conclusion it is, a number of this class of men were, ten or fifteen years ago, inhabitants of the eastern states, and not worth, upon their arrival in Ohio, twenty dollars.*

2. *The Squatter.* The squatter was aptly described by Timothy Flint. Flint was a missionary who spent ten years between 1815 and 1825 in the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys. Although he was always eager to see the better aspects of people among whom he worked, he was an acute observer, and his *Recollections of the Last Ten Years* (1826) form a valuable record of the early West.¹⁴

The people of the Atlantic states have not yet recovered from the horror, inspired by the term "backwoodsman." This prejudice is particularly strong in New England, and is more or less felt from Maine to Georgia. When I first visited this country, I had my full share, and my family by far too much for their comfort. In approaching the country, I heard a thousand stories of gougings, and robberies, and shooting down with the rifle. I have travelled in those regions thousands of miles under all circumstances of exposure and danger. I have travelled alone, or in company only with such as needed protection. Instead of being able to impart it; and this too, in many instances, where I was not known as a minister, or where such knowledge would have had no influence in protecting me. I never have carried the slightest weapon of defence. I scarcely remember to have experienced anything that resembled insult, or to have felt myself in danger from the people. I have often seen men that had lost an eye. Instances of murder, numerous and horrible in their circumstances, have occurred in my vicinity. But they were such lawless rencounters, as terminate in murders everywhere, and in which the drunkenness, brutality, and violence were mutual. There were catastrophies, in which quiet and sober men would be in no danger of being involved.

When we look around these immense regions, and consider that I have been in settlements three hundred miles from any court of justice, when we look at the position of the men, and the state of things, the wonder is that so few outrages and murders occur. [The fact is that] the backwoodsman of the west, as I have seen him, is generally an amiable and virtuous man. His general motive for coming here is to be a freeholder, to have plenty of rich land, and to be able to settle his children about him. It is a most virtuous motive. . . . You find, in truth, that he has vices and barbarisms, peculiar to his situation. His manners are rough. He wears, it may be, a long beard. He has a great quantity of bear or deer skins wrought into his household establishment, his furniture, and [his] dress. He carries a knife, or a dirk in his bosom, and when in the woods has a rifle on his back, and a pack of dogs at his heels. An Atlantic stranger, transferred directly from one of our cities to his door, would recoil from a rencounter with him. But remember, that his rifle and his dogs are among his chief means of support and profit. Remember, that all his first days here were passed in dread of the savages. Remember, that he still encounters them, still meets bears and panthers. Enter his door, and tell him you are benighted, and wish the shelter of his cabin for the night. The welcome is indeed seemingly ungracious: "I reckon you can stay," or "I suppose we

must let you stay." But this apparent ungraciousness is the harbinger of every kindness that he can bestow, and every comfort that his cabin can afford. Good coffee, corn bread and butter, venison, pork, wild and tame fowls are set before you. His wife, timid, silent, reserved, but constantly attentive to your comfort, does not sit at the table with you, but like the wives of the patriarchs, stands and attends on you. You are shown to the best bed which the house can offer. When this kind of hospitality has been afforded you as long as you choose to stay, and when you depart, and speak about your bill, you are most commonly told with some slight mark of resentment, that they do not keep tavern. Even the flaxen-headed urchins will turn away from your money.

3. *The Small Farmer.* For the description of a small farmer, one may turn to the English traveler Harriet Martineau, whom we have already encountered as a visitor to the textile mills at Lowell.¹⁴

Among the most interesting personages in the United States, are the Solitaries;—solitary families, not individuals. Europeans, who think it much to lodge in a country cottage for six weeks in the summer, can form little idea of the life of a solitary family in the wilds. I did not see the most sequestered, as I never happened to lose my way in the forests or on the prairies: but I witnessed some modes of life which realized all I had conceived of the romantic, or of the dismal.

One rainy October day, I saw a settler at work in the forest, on which he appeared to have just entered. His clearing looked, in comparison with the forest behind him, of about the size of a pin-cushion. He was standing, up to the knees in water, among the stubborn stumps, and charred stems of dead trees. He was notching logs with his axe, beside his small log-hut and sty. There was swamp behind, and swamp on each side;—a pool of mud around each dead tree, which had been wont to drink the moisture. There was a semblance of a tumble-down fence: no orchard yet; no grave-yard; no poultry; none of the graces of fixed habitation had grown up. On looking back to catch a last view of the scene, I saw two little boys, about three and four years old, leading a horse home from the forest; one driving the animal behind with an armful of bush, and the other reaching up on tip-toe to keep his hold of the halter; and both looking as if they would be drowned in the swamp. If the mother was watching from the hut, she must have thought this strange dismal play for her little ones. The hard-working father must be toiling for his children, for the success of his after life can hardly atone to him for such a destitution of comfort as I saw him in the midst of. Many such scenes are passed

on every road in the western parts of the States. They become cheering when the plough is seen, or a few sheep are straggling on the hill side, seeming lost in space.

4. *The Well-to-do or Strong-handed Farmer.*

Although in the sequence of settlement the well-to-do farmer appeared last, one of the best descriptions of such an individual was written quite early, probably before the Revolution, by a French settler, Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur, who came to America while the colonies were still under British rule.¹⁴

Let us view now the new colonist as possessed of property. . . . This man, thus bred, from a variety of reasons is determined to improve his fortune by removing to a new district, and resolves to purchase as much land as will afford substantial farms for every one of his children,—a pious thought which causes so many even wealthy people to sell their patrimonial estates to enlarge their sphere of action and leave a sufficient inheritance to their progeny.

No sooner he is resolved than he takes all the information he can with regard to the country he proposes to go and inhabit. He finds out all travelers who have been on the spot; he views maps; attentively weighs the benefits and disadvantages of climate, seasons, situation, etc.; he compares it with his own. A world of most ponderous reflections must needs fill his mind. He at last goes to the capital and applies to some great landholders. He wants to make a purchase. Each party sets forth the peculiar goodness of its tracts in all the various possible circumstances of health, soil, proximity of lakes, rivers, roads, etc. Maps are presented to him; various lots are spread before him as pieces of linen in the shop of a draper. What a sagacity must this common farmer have, first to enable him to choose the province, the country, the peculiar tract most agreeable to his fortune; then to resist, to withstand the sophistry of these learned men armed with all the pomp of their city arguments! Yet his mind is a match for them all. These mathematical lines and sheets of paper which would represent nothing to a man of his class in Europe, yet he understands their meaning, even the various courses by which the rivers and mountains are known. He remembers them while in the woods, and is not at a loss to trace them through the impervious forest, and to reason accurately upon the errors and mistakes which may have been made by the surveyor's neglect or ignorance in the representation of them. He receives proper directions and departs for the intended place, for he wants to view and examine before he purchases.

[An account of the survey and purchase of the property follows.] He departs with all his family,

and great and many are the expenses and fatigues of this removal with cows and cattle. He at last arrives on the spot. He finds himself suddenly deprived of the assistance of friends, neighbors, tradesmen, and of all those inferior links which make a well established society so beautiful and pleasing. He and his family are now alone. On their courage, perseverance, and skill their success depends. There is now no retreating; shame and ruin would infallibly overtake him. What is he to do [equipped as he is] . . . in case of accidents, sickness, and other casualties which may befall his family, his cattle and horses, breaking of the implements of husbandry, etc? A complicated scene presents itself to the contemplative mind, which does the Americans a superlative honour. Whence proceed that vigour and energy, those resources which they never fail to show on these trying occasions? From the singularity of their situation, from what locality of existence which is perfectly peculiar to themselves as a new people improving a new country? . . .

Has he a cow or an ox sick, his anxiety is not less, for they constitute part of his riches. He applies what recipes he possesses; he bleeds, he foment; he has no farrier at hand to assist him. Does either his plough or his cart break, he runs to his tools; he repairs them as well as he can. Do they finally break down, with reluctance he undertakes to rebuild them, though he doubts his success. This was an occupation committed before to the mechanic of the neighborhood, but necessity gives him invention, teaches him to imitate, to recollect what he has seen. Somehow or another 'tis done, and happily there is no traveller, no inquisitive eye to grin and criticize his work. It answers the purposes for the present. Next time he arrives nearer perfection. Behold him henceforth a sort of intuitive carpenter! Happy man, thou hast nothing to demand of propitious heaven but a long life enabling thee to finish the most material part of thy labours, in order to leave each of thy children an improved inheritance. Thank God and thy fate, they give your wife the power to weave. This happy talent constitutes the most useful part of her portion. Then all is with thee as well as it can be. The yarn which the daughters have spun will now be converted into coarse but substantial cloth. Thus his flax and wool clothes the entire family; most women are something of tailors. Thus if they are healthy, these settlers find within themselves a resource against all probable accidents.

His ingenuity in the fields is not less remarkable in executing his rural work in the most expeditious manner. . . .

Thus this man devoid of society learns more than ever to center every idea within that of his own welfare. To him all that appears good, just, equitable, has a necessary relation to himself and

family. He has been so long alone that he has almost forgot the rest of mankind except it is when he carries his crops on the snow to some distant market.

The country, however, fills with new inhabitants. His granary is resorted to from all parts by other beginners who did not come so well prepared. How will he sell his grain to these people who are strangers to him? Shall he deduct the expense of carrying it to a distant mill? This would appear just, but where is the necessity of this justice? His neighbors absolutely want his supply; they can't go to other places. He, therefore, concludes upon having the full price. He remembers his former difficulties; no one assisted him then. Why should he assist others? They are all able to work for themselves. He has a large family, and it would be giving its lawful substance away; he cannot do it. How should he be charitable? He has scarcely seen a poor man in his life. How should he be merciful, except from native instinct? He has never heard that it was a necessary qualification, and he has never seen objects that required the benefits of his sympathy. He has had to struggle alone through numbers of difficult situations and inconveniences; he therefore deals hardly with his new neighbours. If they are not punctual in their payment, he prosecutes them at law, for by this time its benefits have reached him. 'Tis laid out into a new county, and divided into townships. Perhaps he takes a mortgage on his neighbor's land. But it may happen that it is always encumbered by anterior and more ponderous debts. He knows instinctively the coercive power of the laws: He impeaches the cattle; he has proper writings drawn; he gets bonds in judgment. He secures himself; and all this is done from native knowledge; he has [neighbors but no] counsellor nor adviser. Who can be wiser than himself in this half-cultivated country? The sagacity peculiar to the American never forsakes him; it may slumber sometimes, but upon the appearance of danger it arises again as vigorous as ever.

But behold him happily passed through the course of many laborious years; his wealth, and therefore, his consequence increase with the progress of the settlement. If he is litigious, overbearing, purse-proud, which will very probably be the bent of his mind, he has a large field. Among so many beginners there need be many needy, inconsiderate, drunken, and lazy. He may bring the necessary severity of the law to flourish even in these wilds. Well may we be subjects to its lash, or else we would be too happy, for this is almost all the tribute we pay.

Now advanced in life and grown rich, he builds a good substantial stone or frame house, and the humble log one, under which he has so much prospered, becomes the kitchen. Several roads intersect and meet near this spot, which he has

contrived on purpose. He becomes an inn-holder and country merchant. . . . [In self-interest] he sells for good that which perhaps he knows to be indifferent, because he also knows that the ashes he has collected, the wheat he has taken in may not be so good or so clean as it was asserted.

. . . Is it a wonder that new rules of action should arise? It must constitute a new set of opin-

ions, the parent of manners. You have already observed this colonist is necessarily different from what he was in the more ancient settlements he originally came from; become such by his new local situation, his new industry, that share of cunning which was absolutely necessary in consequence of his intercourse with his new neighbours.

B.

ASPECTS OF WESTERN LIFE

The following selections illustrate conditions in the West during the frontier phase and, in the last instance, as it was beginning to emerge from that phase and to develop a social structure more closely resembling that of the eastern states.

1. *The Technique of Settlement.* The characteristic unit of living in the early West was the cabin in the clearing. For an explanation of how the settler created this unit—how he secured title to his land, how he built his dwelling, how he prepared the land for cultivation—we may turn to a description by the English political economist, Thomas Cooper, who came to America, became a friend of Jefferson, and lived in Pennsylvania and South Carolina for the remainder of his life.¹⁵

When a first settler of this description removing into the back country, fixes upon a spot of land, which he usually buys, paying for it in gales [installment payments], his first care is to cut down a few trees to build his log house. A man can cut down and lop from twenty to thirty trees in a day of the size proper for the purpose. These form the walls of the building. In general, the log cabins of this kind are such as half a dozen men will easily finish in three or four days. Ten guineas worth of labour thus employed will lodge a family quite as comfortably as in the better kind of cottages in England.

He then proceeds to grub the land, *i.e.* to take up the small trees, shoots, and underwood, by the roots: these are burnt upon the ground. In a general way this may be contracted for at about 20s. an acre. Whitaker reckoned that it cost him usually five days work of a man to whom (as it is very hard work) he pays 3s. a day, finding him in victuals and allowing him a dram of whiskey morning and evening. The prices of this kind of work will easily be conceived to vary according to circumstances. Where land is heavily timbered with trees of two or three feet diameter, as it is about the heads of the creeks, and on the islands of the Susquehanna, the underwood is in small proportion, but the expence of clearing much greater.

The land being grubbed, the trees immediately

about the house are cut down, and for the present another portion is girdled only. This process destroying the vegetation of the branches, lets in the light and air sufficiently to ensure a crop the next season. The trees cut down, are split into a kind of rail for fences, which are made by laying these pieces angular-wise one on the top of another, to the height of six or seven in number, much in the same way as the logs of a house are laid on each other, but slanting in alternate directions. A post and rail fence is not thought of till some years afterwards. The ground is then slightly ploughed, or perhaps scratched only with an harrow, and the grain is sown and harrowed in.

The trees cut down are never rooted up. The value of the land gained will not pay the expence of doing this. They are cut off about 18 inches or 2 feet from the ground. The side roots are obstructions to the plough for about two years, when they are completely rotted. The stumps in New York and Pennsylvania States, do not rot away completely under ten years. In Virginia and Maryland this happens in about seven. It appears to me, that by cutting off the tree a few inches below the surface of the ground, and covering the stump with mould, the expence would not be much increased, the deformity, which is indeed a great one in an American landscape, would be prevented, and the process of putrefaction accelerated. I never heard of but one person (Lord Stirling in New Jersey) who had his trees rooted up; and I have no doubt of its having been done at an expence much beyond the convenience gained.

2. *Money and Trade in the Early West.* Crèvecoeur's description of the well-to-do farmer has already indicated that, at one stage of pioneer life, the settler was almost wholly self-sufficing—that is, he lived on his own produce and procured neither goods nor services by purchase, partly because there was no one from whom he could buy, partly because he had no cash income with which to

buy. The extremely limited basis on which trade was conducted and the means by which some exchange took place in the absence of a monetary medium is suggested by an anecdote by Baynard Rush Hall, a clergyman and educator, who described his experiences in early Indiana in a volume entitled *The New Purchase*.¹⁶

I now prepared to return home: and just then, a young chap rode by on his way to Johnson's store; for Spiceburg was a large village, containing, first, Mr. Johnson's Store; second, a blacksmith's establishment: and third, Josey Jackson's post-office, which last was also a tavern, and now becoming a kind of opposition store: although an opposition post-office would have been more serviceable, both to town and country. The chap named, immediately hailed me, and made a proposal for me to wait till he had done his purchases, when we could ride home in company. As Sam lived in an adjoining settlement, and I really wanted company (to say nothing of political news),—I readily agreed to wait, although we well knew it would be some hours before the bargains were concluded.

In a New Purchase country, "going to store" is as much for recreation as business, and preparation is made as for any other treat or amusement. The store is, too, the place for news, recent and stale—for gymnastics, wrestling, pitching quoits, running,—for rifle shooting—for story-telling, &c.—and hence, a purchaser's stay is not in direct ratio to his intended bargains, but rather in the inverse; a fellow having only six cents to spend, will sometimes lounge in and around a store for six hours! Nor must even that be wholly imputed to the fellow's idleness. It is in part, owing to his unwillingness to part with—cash; and when it is considered how very difficult it was then, and maybe now, in the New Purchase to get hold of "silver," then it will appear that to lay out even a fippenny-bit must have become a matter for very solemn reflection, and very *lengthy* chaffering. In my time, rarely indeed, could two cash dollars be seen circulating together; and having then no banks, and being suspicious of all foreign paper, we carried on our operations almost exclusively by trade. For goods, store-keepers received the vast bulk of their pay in produce, which was converted into cash at Louisville, Cincinnati, or more frequently at New-Orleans. The great house of Glenville and Carlton paid for all things in—leather. Hence, occasionally when a wood-chopper must have shoes and yet had no produce, but offered to pay in "chopping," we, not needing that article, and being indebted to several neighbours who did, used to send the man and his axe as the circulating medium in demand among our

own creditors, to *chop out* the bills against us. . . .

My friend Sam to-day had come to town with two silver-fippenny-bits, and a roll of tow linen; and he intended to buy four panes of glass, 8 by 10's, half a pound of store-coffee, eighth of a pound of store-tea, one quarter pound of gunpowder, and a pound of lead: also, if they could be got cheap, a string of button moles and a needle. Sam prided himself on being a hard hand at a bargain, and Mr. Johnson, I well knew, although an honest man, was a prudent dealer and, therefore, I determined to remain in the store and witness the trading. The colloquy opened thus, after Sam had deposited his roll of linen on the counter:

"Well, Johnson, you don't want no tow linen to-day, I allow—do you?"

"If 'tis good. What do you want for it?"

"I allow to take half trade and half silver as near about as we can fix it."

"Sam, you're joking—we don't give cash for anything but pork and lard."

"That's powerful stingy—well, what's this piece worth—it's powerful fine."

"This; (examining)—'tis pretty good—'tis worth ten cents in silver. We give twelve in trade."

"Ketch a duck asleep!—if that 'ere tow linen there aint worth fifteen cents in store-tea or coffee ither, I'll bet old Nan—(his rifle)—again two-shot gun! Howe'er I'll track round a little—I wants any how to go over to the post-office, maybe there's a paper come."

Now this, reader, was all gum; Sam could not read a word. He intended this as a threat to deal in the opposition store, and Mr. Johnson so understood it: in fact he had anticipated such a move, and for that purpose had underrated the linen, intending to raise the true value as if induced so to by Sam's superior dexterity, by which the linen would be secured and his customer pleased. And therefore, Mr. J. thus answered:

"Sam! Sam! you're a hard Christian: but I've large payments at Louisville, and you've been a pretty good customer, and a cent or so aint much—and rather than let you go to Josey's, I'll give you thirteen cents."

Now this Sam thought just one cent higher than the linen was worth; yet it was in reality precisely half a cent less—and that other half cent Johnson intended finally to give him. Hence when Sam replied, "Well! I raythur allow as maybe perhaps Josey would a sorter give fourteen cents; but I don't like to d'sart old friends, and so says I, jist gimme thirteen and a half cents, and it's trade!" it was what Mr. Johnson was prepared to hear. Accordingly, after affecting to consult a book of prices, (I think it was an old counting-house almanac) and after figuring away

at the double rule of three in vulgar fractions, at all which Sam stared as at a magical operation, Johnson at last looked up, and scratching his head, said:—

"Let's see—eight-sixteenths is four-eighths, and that is one half—and half is two-fourths—and five per cent—and tow linen at a discount—why, Sam, you'll break a fellow some day or other—still I can't lose more than a fraction of a cent on a yard, and I must not let you go to Josey's. Well, I'll give thirteen and a half, and it's a bargain. Now, what will you have?"

"Well, I'm goin to see how the new skow's comin on—and you may measure the linen till I get back, and then we'll take it out in something or nuther."

And with that away went Sam, leaving Mr. Johnson to measure off the piece; for while he affected to fear the storekeeper would cheat him in price, he never dreamed that he would either lessen the number of yards or miscalculate the sum in his own favour. Nor was his confidence abused, for Johnson was an honest man, and had only used indirection to come at the true price, because of Sam's perverse sagacity in bargains. . . .

It was a full hour before Sam's return; and then the quantum suff. of tea, coffee, glass, &c. being furnished, the balance of trade was found against him, and he owed the store precisely nine and a quarter cents. In lieu of this Mr. J. offered to take one of Sam's silver fips, which although a liberal discount in Sam's favour he regarded as right down . . . usury; and the storekeeper was obliged to book the nine and a quarter cents, to be paid in "sang." Nor was this conduct of Sam's so very surprising, when it is recollected that for one hundred and twenty-five cents could be bought a whole acre of land! bottom land! trees! spice bush! papaws! and all: hence to ask for six and a fourth cents, was asking a pretty good slice off an acre! Sam was, therefore, really indignant.

3. *Evolution from the Frontier Condition.*

An early settler in the West, S. R. Brown by name, visited Lexington, Kentucky, in 1797. He returned again in 1816 to find even at this early time that this new town of the West was developing in a way that made it much less distinctive in a sectional sense than it had been at the time of his previous visit.¹⁷

I had occasion to visit this place in the summer of 1797; it then contained about 50 houses, partly frame, and hewn logs, with the chimneys *out side*; the surrounding country was then new; a village lot could have been purchased for \$30, and a good farm in its vicinity for \$5 an acre. The best farmers lived in log cabins, and wore hunting shirts and

leggings. In May last, (1816) business again called me to Lexington. But how changed the scene! Every thing had assumed a new appearance. The beautiful vale of Town Fork, which in 1797, I saw variegated with cornfields, meadows, and trees, had in my absence been covered with stately and elegant buildings—in short, a large and beautiful town had arisen by the creative genius of the west. The log cabins had disappeared, and in their places stood costly brick mansions, well painted and enclosed by fine yards, bespeaking the taste and wealth of their possessors. The leathern pantaloons, the hunting shirts and leggings had been discarded, for the dress and manners of the inhabitants had entirely changed. The scenery around Lexington, almost equals that of the elysium of the ancients. Philadelphia, with all its surrounding beauties scarcely equals it. . . . Main street presents to the traveller as much wealth, and more beauty than can be found in most of the atlantic cities. It is about 80 feet wide, level, compactly built, well paved, and having foot ways, twelve feet wide on each side. I was surprised to see at every step, finely painted brick stores, three stories high, and well filled with costly and fanciful merchandize. Near the centre of the town is the public square, lined on every side with large substantial brick houses, stores, hotels, &c. In this square stands the market house, which is of brick, and well furnished on Wednesdays and Saturdays; but occasionally the scene of a barbarous practice; for it is here that incorrigible or delinquent negroes are flogged unmercifully. I saw this punishment inflicted on two of these wretches. Their screams soon collected a numerous crowd—I could not help saying to myself, "These cries are the knell of Kentucky liberty." I had not leisure to count the buildings, and found no person capable of giving the requisite information. This town *appears* as large and populous as Cincinnati, which contained in 1816, 1000 houses and 6000 souls. The public buildings consist of several churches, belonging to methodists, presbyterians, baptists, seceders, episcopalians, and Roman catholics. The court house is a three story brick building, with a cupola rising from the middle of a square roof, and contains a bell and a town clock. The Masanoic Hall and the Bank, are fine brick buildings. There is a public library, and a university called Transylvania, liberally endowed, the terms of tuition are \$200 per annum. There is a female academy, where the following branches are taught, viz. reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar, correspondence, elocution, rhetoric, geography, astronomy, ancient and modern history, chronology, mythology, music, drawing, embroidery, &c. The taverns and boarding houses are neat and well furnished. *Wilson's* hotel is excelled by none in America,

for extensiveness, style and good living. The streets are often thronged with well dressed people. A prodigious quantity of European goods are retailed to the crowd of customers, who resort here from the neighboring settlements. There are two bookstores, and three printing offices, from which are issued as many weekly papers, viz: the Reporter, and Kentucky Gazette, both republican, and the Monitor, federal, and the only one of that political cast in the state. The inhabitants are as polished, and I regret to add, as luxurious as those of Boston, New-York or Baltimore; and their assemblies and parties are conducted with as much ease and grace, as in the oldest towns of the union. The manufactories are extensive, and promise a continued growth of the town. There are four nail factories, which manufacture seventy tons of nails yearly—two copper and tin manufactories—several jewellers and silversmiths, ten sadler shops, five cabinet shops, and three painters, seven tailor shops, an umbrella manufactory, twelve blacksmiths, two gunsmith shops, several tobacconists, five chair makers, three dyers, six hatters, sixteen shoemakers, two stocking weavers; besides tanneries, breweries, distilleries, cooperies, brickyards, carding machines, &c. The rope walks

are on a large scale, and its manufactures of hemp in 1811, were valued at \$500,000. There are several cotton and woolen manufactories—three steam grist mills, and two steam paper mills. The Lexington woolen manufactory, erected by Messrs. Prentiss & Co. and Mr. Sanders large cotton manufactory are built on the Town Fork, about a mile south-west of the town. They went into operation in June last. Mr. Sanders employed about 150 hands; the articles manufactured, consist of cotton yarns, sheeting, shirting, bedticking, counterpanes, table cloths, chambrays, cassinets, sattinets, woolen cords, &c. The woolen manufactory also employed 150 hands—it manufactures, broadcloths, cassimeres, blankets, and flannels. It has a steam paper mill connected with it, which produces paper of a fine quality. The other paper mill rivals any establishment of the kind in the United States.

There are between fifty and sixty *villas*, or handsome country residences in the vicinity of Lexington, and that of Henry Clay, Speaker of the House of Representatives, may be pronounced one of the most delightful. It is situated about one mile east of the town, on an agreeable rise, and is nearly surrounded with poplar and locust groves.

V

Life in the South and the Clash of Sections

It is a social war—so far not a war of arms—a war of sentiment, of opinion; a war by one form of society against another form of society.

JAMES M. MASON of Virginia
in the U.S. Senate, December 10, 1860

CONTENTS

Questions for Study	126
Historical Background	127
Part I: Social Patterns of the South	129
Part II: Sectional Antagonisms and Issues	134

QUESTIONS FOR STUDY

1. In the light of contemporary descriptions of southern plantations, what, if any, modifications would apply to the traditional, romantic picture of plantation life? Which description corresponds most closely to the romantic tradition?
2. Thomas E. Watson presents evidence bearing on the intellectual and religious interests of his own family and of other planters in middle Georgia. Does this evidence support or contradict the description by Hildreth, given later in the Problem?
3. Timothy Dwight has appeared in Problem I as a nationalist. Here he seems ultrasectional. What conditions in 1777 stimulated his nationalistic impulses and what ones in the later period stimulated his sectionalism?
4. Is the disagreement between J. B. D. De Bow and Richard Hildreth a question of what qualities the people of the South actually possessed or a question of what value to attach to qualities which both authors regarded as characteristic of the South?
5. Although there were in the first half of the nineteenth century a number of public questions on which divisions tended to follow sectional lines, complete sectional solidarity was prevented by the presence in each section of certain economic groups which would not share the motivation of their respective sections. Explain, especially with reference to the tariff and the bank.
6. Plot on an outline map of United States the vote of each state on the Tariff of 1828. What sectional trends appear and what exceptions challenge the trend?
7. The vote on the recharter of the Bank of the United States indicates a sectional trend, but with prominent exceptions. How does the discussion by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., explain these exceptions?
8. Was there ever any cooperation between the South and West on internal improvements? If so, what evidence is there that the alliance broke down by the 1830s? What do the selections from Hockett and McKay contribute to explaining why such an alliance would have gone to pieces?
9. Why could not the South be effectively included in Clay's "American system"?
10. Explain why the interest of the Northeast and the South in the tariff question led these sections to take varying courses on the public-land question.
11. The votes on the public-land question show quite clearly how an alliance between the South and West gave way to one between the North and West. Explain.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The two major regions treated in Problem IV—that is, the North and West—exhibited striking contrasts and dissimilarities at some times and in some phases, but much of the difference lay in the degree of maturity which each had attained. Backwoods Ohio at the beginning of the nineteenth century bore a striking resemblance to the interior of New England at the beginning of the eighteenth. The people of both regions were largely of the same stock, and parts of the Old Northwest constituted a greater New England, just as parts of the Southwest formed a greater Virginia. Given time, the newer sections aspired only to emulate their prototypes, and there was no real clash of social values.

But a third section, the South, was set apart by much more basic dissimilarities. Apart from the climatic features which had given the region a distinctive flora and fauna and even a soil composition unlike that of glaciated areas farther north, the South possessed marked differences in social and economic structure. Where the North maintained a mixed economy of industry, agriculture, and commerce and the West devoted itself largely to the production of foodstuffs, the South had relied almost from the beginning upon certain crops which were produced primarily for export. During the Colonial period the foremost of these had been tobacco (from Virginia and Maryland), supplemented by rice and indigo, which dominated the economy of Carolina. For more than 150 years tobacco was the principal export from North America to the Old World.

The production of staple crops lent itself to the use of gang labor, and the long growing season invited the maintenance of a permanent labor force. Nothing supplied a permanent force of unskilled labor on so large a scale as the slave traffic from Africa. Hence, Negro slavery became a characteristic feature of the southern economy. Equally characteristic was the large unit of production, the plantation, which accommodated itself to the employment of large numbers of workers and to production on a commercial scale. In the tobacco and rice belts, plantation slavery grew to dominate the economy.

For an interval around the time of the American Revolution it appeared that the staple crops would be restricted to the traditional rice and tobacco districts and that the rapidly developing southern hinterland might grow up without the plantation system, which would thereupon languish within relatively narrow limits. But at the beginning of the century new staples came in. In Louisiana sugar culture became widespread after the discovery in 1795 by Étienne de Boré of a new process for granulating the juice of the cane.

Although this development was of great economic importance, it was far overshadowed by the invention by Eli Whitney in 1793 of the cotton gin, which made the production of cotton commercially profitable. The demand of the English textile market for cotton fibers seemed limitless, and as a consequence, a cotton revolution swept across the lower South, carrying the plantation system into regions which had previously seemed most inhospitable to such a regime. Thus at a time when pioneer migration was transforming the West and industry was effecting a similar transformation in the North, the cotton economy was advancing with giant strides from middle Georgia to the Brazos River bottoms of Texas. Every decade from 1790 to 1840 cotton production doubled, and as it did so the center of production moved westward. In 1835 Alabama and Mississippi, which had been almost uninhabited a generation earlier, produced more cotton than the earlier centers of production in South Carolina and Georgia. Cotton, with its accompaniments of the plantation system and slave labor, thus imparted a highly distinctive sectional character to the South and to the southern people, who adjusted their patterns of life to the conditions of the cotton culture.

The present Problem continues the analysis of patterns of American life by presenting accounts of life for the South comparable to those already given for the North and West. Having completed this panorama of the sections, the Problem then turns to the question of friction between the sections—of the way in which the social values of one section caused it to distrust the people and to disparage the values of other sections, and of the way in which the economic interests of the sections diverged, with the result that they followed discordant political policies and came into conflict over specific public issues. In analyzing important sectional issues the Problem does not deal with the question of slavery, partly because Problem VI will be devoted entirely to this greatest of sectional questions, and partly because it is desirable to establish the fact that the sectional conflict was far more than a struggle over slavery.

Part I.

SOCIAL PATTERNS OF THE SOUTH

Life in the Northeast was too varied to be represented by a single symbol, but the symbolic unit of living in the pioneer West was the cabin in the clearing, and the stereotype of the South was the "old plantation." To reconstruct southern life accurately, however, it is essential to clear away a thick crust of romance which has pictured the South as a region consisting wholly of great landed estates, occupied by a leisured and cultivated aristocracy. Statistically, the cold fact is that very few southerners belonged to the plantation-owning class, and those who did seldom enjoyed the idyllic life of the legend. The only Americans who can confidently assume that their ancestors lived on large plantations are the Negroes, for most slaves were plantation slaves, but only a few thousand white people dwelt within the charmed circle of great planter families.

Yet when a wholesome discount is applied, the plantation of reality, rather than that of romance, retains a position of major importance. Like the factory in the North, it possessed an influence disproportionate to the number of people whom it engaged, because, economically, it produced a large share of the regional income and, socially, it provided much of the leadership of the region. Moreover, it symbolized something to which almost all southerners aspired and thus set the social values for the entire population of the rural South. Consequently a study of patterns of life in the South must concern itself almost wholly with rural life and very much with plantation life. But in applying this approach it is important to recognize (1) the difference between romance and reality for the large plantations and (2) the wide range of difference between large and small slaveholding units. At all times it should be remembered that nothing lends itself more readily to reckless generalization than a survey of the social habits and personality traits of a whole people.

1. *A Mississippi Planter's Life.* During the 1850s a young citizen of Michigan, A. De Puy Van Buren, went to Mississippi, where he planned to conduct a school. He found a demand for his educational services among the cotton planters along the Yazoo River and took up his residence at one of the plantations, which was called "Willow Dale." Van Buren's descriptions illustrate various aspects of plantation life.¹

Mr. P., another of the patrons of our little academy, is a North Carolinian. He has read many a quaint and rare old volume; and is a very good naturalist—the best I have met anywhere in this region. To him, and his young and accomplished lady, I am indebted for much of the enjoyment of my life South. At their noble mansion, in Willow Dale, I became acquainted with many fine Southern gentlemen and ladies.

His very large, fine residence is half hid in the luxuriant shade of many beautiful and rare trees. There is the umbrageous China-tree, in all its rich, feathery foliage; the deep-green, and the dingy, broad-leaved mulberry; the Lombardy poplar, with its top shooting up in tall, nodding plumes; the aspen, with its leaden-hued leaves lined with silver; the box-elder, the golden willow, the lovely althea, the sensitive mimosa, and all

the evergreen trees, shrubs and vines, with a wild profusion of flowers and roses.

The honeysuckle clammers over a lattice-work well-house to the left of the residence, while in front, on each side of the gate within the palings, is a trellis-frame; the wood bine has climbed over and hung thick with festoons the one, and the white jasmine the other. Then, there stands on the open lawn before the house, the beautiful Spanish and willow oak, with the noble elm, and many a lofty pecan, in all their forest grandeur.

The plantation proper, that part that is cultivated, is some four hundred acres. I presume Mr. P. has a thousand or two acres in all. He raises usually two or three thousand bushels of corn, and makes three hundred bales of cotton. He is supposed to be worth \$100,000. A young widow, a short distance up the river from here, is worth half a million.

Mr. P.'s house is a capacious mansion, sixty-five feet square, two stories high, both verandaed. Many a planter with thrice his wealth has a rough log dwelling for his home.

I have said before that the planters built their houses of nearly the same style. Following this out as a hint, I find they are much given to mannerism among themselves. For instance, you generally find in their houses a large high-posted, heavy-topped bedstead—some cost over a hundred dollars, and

are massive and rich. One would think that such a piece of furniture was a relic of feudal days, on which once had couched the chivalrous CUER DE LEON [*sic*], or WILLIAM the Conqueror, or the lordly inmates of Warwick or Windsor Castle. I might mention other instances.

The family of Mr. P. consists of himself and lady, four children, and an Irish girl as their seamstress. You frequently find poor, white young ladies sewing in their families.

Mr. P.'s slaves were divided into house-servants, carpenter and blacksmith, and field-hands. The servants about the house are well-dressed, and each has his or her respective duty to perform. Aunt BETTY, the cook, is in her "sanctum," hard by the dining room, and during meals a servant is in direct communication with her and the table, who conveys the viands warm to the table, and replenishes them as soon as they get cold.

The planter's fare is simple, and the chase supplies his table with much of its meat. I am not only pleased with this simple fare of the planter's board, but with their manner of sitting at table.

Their tables are usually long, and remain stationary in the dining-room.

The father, at meals, takes seat at one end of the table, his eldest son at his right, then the next younger, and so on, down to the "wee bairn" that can "toddle" to his seat.

The mother is seated at the other end of the table, and her eldest daughter at her right, the sister next in age succeeding, down to the youngest. The guests, if gentlemen, are seated at the planter's left hand; if ladies, at his wife's left. If the father is a member of the church, a blessing is asked. I have known those, who did not profess to be Christians, ask blessings at their tables.

The boiled ham, cooked whole always, and which, on extra occasions, is tricked off with cloves, green leaves, and various-colored dainty bits, in a tasteful manner, is placed before the planter; his wife has the tea, coffee, and the delicacies before her. By the aid of servants every one at table is served.

In no place, not even in the most back-woods part of the country, have I ever heard what one often hears in the country, especially at the North, immediately after being seated at table, "Now take hold and help yourself."

But again. The planter takes his time in eating—don't "bolt it down," as the Yankees do. Leisure and ease are inmates of his roof. He takes no note of time. Your Yankee will take time by the fore-lock, and push business through. But a Southern, never heard of the "old man with the scythe."

Our evenings at Willow Dale were given to amusements. After one becomes acquainted with Southern life, he sees that society here must have them. In other lands, where life has a pursuit, less

amusement is required. But here, where one finds its golden leisure, amusements are indispensable. The ladies of our household read, were fond of the works of literature and romance, and among authors they were very fond of SCOTT. He is a favorite of the South. Of the manners and scenes in his novels one is much reminded among this people. Nowhere have I enjoyed reading him so much as in this clime. I have read books here that would have given one the *ennui* to have read at home. Life here has its tranquil repose, and a book in your hand is like a friend, that is entertaining and enjoying it with you. And there is no noise, nor any one to disturb you. A bird-note from a China-tree is sweeter, because you enjoy it unalloyed by any other sound; and the reading of a book is pleasanter, because there is no one to molest or find fault with, and call you indolent or *delleltantish*. The "enjoyment of literature in such a place is like feeding among the lillies in the Song of Solomon."

I have seen Willow Dale so quiet for hours that the birds would stop singing in its trees, in love of its silence. And then, when the sportive laugh or merry shout of the children playing in the yard, sounded out, or the whistle or splashing of a steamer, passing by, or the halloo of a stranger at the gate, and the hounds baying at him, you heard and listened to them with pleasure.

Besides reading, and the light work of the needle, our ladies gave their time to various pleasures—visiting and receiving visits, music, vocal and instrumental, the dance, cards, and *tete-a-tete*. Whist is universally acknowledged a lady's game. But euchre is the game of the South, and by choice, the Southern lady's game. I must confess to predilection for chess, and I always found some one of our evening circle ready to play with me. But they also play whist and the various other amusing games with cards, which here are manifold. To other games, and those above mentioned, and frequent chats about books and authors, our evenings were given.

Then we had moon-light sails on the noble Yazoo. I have no desire to disparage the North—my birth-place and home are there, and I love her. But there is a charm in Southern moon-light that I never before felt, that makes the night exceedingly lovely. It was on one of these lovely nights when—

"The moon like a rick on fire had risen
o'er the dale,"

and the silvery Yazoo flowed murmurless between the deep, heavy foliage of willows that hung over it on each side, like a soft, undulating bank of green, that a party of us at Willow Dale stepped into the boat, with a favorite negro, an adept at the oar, for oarsman, to take a moonlight sail. We were on a serenading trip—were going to

serenade Dr. Y.'s daughter at "Rough and Ready"—her home, one mile up the river.

It had been previously arranged that the trip should be wholly romantic—our language poetical, and that all, in unison with everything around us, should be—ideal. Being seated in a fine row-boat, we silently glided up stream. It is beautiful to sail in a light boat "on such a night," when all nature is asleep, and, on a river itself, in a lethargic tranquility when no sound is heard but the light dipping and soft plashing of the oars in the water, and the muffled sound of their working in the row-locks. And where the voice has a charmed sound that the night and the water give, and when you are fonder of talking, of music, and musing, and fonder of your own existence.

Thus in love with ourselves and the scene around us, we moved up stream, repeating passages of poetry and snatches of song, that the occasion was full of, and half expressed.

Thus we were sailing up stream, all poetry and romance, when I thoughtlessly remarked, that the trip was half performed, for we had passed the "old gin-house," standing hard by on the bank.

At which one of the Miss B.'s cried out, "There, you have broken the spell of romance, by uttering such a vulgar word as *gin-house*!"

I begged her pardon, and told her I would enclose the word in a parenthetical coffin, and bury it in the river; and assured the party that I had been deceived—that it was an old ruined castle, overhung with moss and ivy, which I had mistaken for the above-mentioned building. . . .

One meets, in traveling here on the road, throughout the country, the negro, driving fine carriages or costly coaches, with his beautiful "*proteges*" in them—the planter's wife and her daughters; also ladies on their palfreys galloping through the woods; the planter and his sons, ever on horseback, with a large portmanteau swung across their saddles, for carrying sundries; or, if he is on the hunt, he is equipped for it, followed by his hounds; and, if returning from the chase, the most of them will have a deer swung across their horses, behind the saddle, and negroes mounted, carrying others. . . .

[*A visit to a neighboring plantation.*] On coming up to "Rose Hill" plantation, we seemed to be approaching "old Drummond Castle, of Hawthornden," or some other old English Castle, seated on a fine eminence, commanding a view of its rough, widely-extended and broken domain. It is a princely mansion, looking out from its elevated position through a wealth of evergreen-trees and shrubs; and many a lordly oak throws its shade over its sloping lawns.

We passed through several gates and yards be-

fore we were ushered, by a servant that had met us at the first gate, into the inner grounds about the "Castle." Here we found a rich profusion of ornamental trees, among them the magnolia, the holly, and all the evergreens—even the mistletoe, on a large shade-tree, was pointed out to us. There was neatness, taste and beauty displayed in laying out and adorning these grounds.

The residence is a two-story building, the second plantation-house we had seen in the uplands not built of logs. It has three dormer windows in front, and a fine porch with a railing running around it, and a little lattice-gate in its center, to which you ascend by four steps, and over which Colonel R.'s hand was extended, ever ready to receive and welcome his guests.

2. *A Louisiana Magnate.* The manner of life which developed among the more wealthy planters was described in 1826 by Timothy Flint, who had made a trip down the Mississippi and met some of the leading sugar planters of Louisiana.²

The opulent planters of this state have many amiable traits of character. They are high-minded and hospitable, in an eminent degree. I have sojourned much among them, and have never experienced a more frank, dignified, and easy hospitality. . . . You enter without ceremony, call for what you wish, and intimate your wishes to the servants. In short you are made to feel yourself at home. This simple and noble hospitality seems to be a general trait among these planters, for I have not yet called at a single house, where it has not been exercised towards me. Suppose the traveller to be a gentleman, to speak French, and to have letters to one respectable planter, it becomes an introduction to the settlement, and he will have no occasion for a tavern.

It results in some way from their condition, from their ample income, or perhaps as they would say, from the influence of slavery, that they are liberal in their feelings, as it respects expenditure, and are more reckless of the value of money, than any people that I have seen. The ladies no doubt have their tea-table, or rather their coffee-table scandal. But I confess, that I have seen less of that prying curiosity to look into the affairs of neighbours, and have heard less scandal here, than in other parts of the United States.

The luxury of the table is carried to a great extent among them. They are ample in their supply of wines, though Claret is generally drunk. Every family is provided with Claret, as we at the North are with cider. I have scarcely seen an instance of intoxication among the respectable planters. In drinking, the guests universally raise their glasses, and touch them together instead of a health. In the morning, before you rise, a cup

of strong coffee is offered you. After the dessert at dinner, you are offered another. It is but very recently that the ladies have begun to drink tea. During the warm months, before you retire, it is the custom in many places for a black girl to take off your stockings, and perform the ancient ceremonial of washing the feet. . . .

An intelligent and instructed planter's family is certainly a delightful family in which to make a short sojourn, and they have many of the lesser virtues exercised in a way so peculiar, and appropriate to their modes of existence, as to impress you with all the freshness of novelty. Unhappily, as appertains to all earthly things, there is a dark ground to the picture. The men are "sudden and quick in quarrel." The dirk or the pistol is always at hand. Fatal duels frequently occur. They are profane, and excessively addicted to gambling. This horrible vice, so intimately associated with so many others, prevails like an epidemic. Money gotten easily, and without labour, is easily lost. Betting and horse-racing are amusements eagerly pursued, and often times to the ruin of the parties. A Louisianian will forego any pleasure, to witness and bet at a horse-race. Even the ladies visit these amusements, and bet with the gentlemen.

3. *A Prosperous Georgian.* Shortly before the Civil War Thomas E. Watson was a young boy living at the home of his Grandfather Horton in middle Georgia. Horton owned eighty-one slaves and thus qualified statistically as a great planter, for there were less than 4000 holdings as large as his in the entire South. In 1904 Watson described his grandfather's place in a book entitled *Bethany*.³

We Hortons were a family of middle-class farmers. We had never been anything else. We never expected to be anything else. Our condition was good enough for us. We had plenty of land. We had always had it. From the time that the original Horton came down into East Georgia, along with a Quaker Colony, from North Carolina, which took possession of a tract of forty thousand acres, we had occupied the comfortable position of local landowners.

The Hortons had grown tobacco on their farms until Eli Whitney, Jesse Bull, Nathan Lyons, Daniel Pratt, and several others, invented the cotton-gin. Then they began to grow cotton. But they never failed to make it their object to produce on the farm the necessary supplies: tobacco or cotton being merely the surplus crop, the "money" crop.

Yes: we had prospered: and had always been independent. We were not rich, you understand: just comfortable; with good farms, fat stock, and likely niggers. We owed no debts; we had a few

hundred of dollars in pocket, ready for an emergency—such as a request for a loan to some friend who might have got into a temporary "tight" by betting on the wrong horse, or by trying to make four queens beat a straight flush.

In such cases, the neighbor was welcome to the money. Perhaps he might give his "Promisserry" note for it. Oftener, he did not. To take a "Promisserry" note was considered very formal—if not exacting.

My grandfather owned some thirteen hundred acres of land, and his slaves, counting the children, numbered eighty-one. He was a man of few words, had no fondness for display, was well satisfied with his modest fortune; and in a quiet way took a pride in the fine appearance of his fields, fences, houses, mules, cows, hogs, and negroes. His face was rather stern, his eye somewhat severe, and his manner did not invite familiarity. Tall, square-framed, towering above other men, my grandfather filled me with awe. I used to wonder whether he was not a fair agricultural copy of General Washington.

The mansion in which we lived was a very modest affair. It did not, in the least, resemble a Grecian Temple which had been sent into exile, and which was striving, unsuccessfully, to look at ease among corn-cribs, cow-pens, horse-stables, pig-styes, chicken-houses, negro cabins, and worm-fenced cotton fields. It did not perch upon the top of the highest hill for miles around, and brow-beat the whole community with its arrogant self-assertion. No: ours was just a plain house and none too large, not built out of bricks brought over from England, but of timbers torn from the heart of the long-leaf Georgia pine.

The main body was made of logs hewed with the broad-axe, smoothed with the footadze, and joined powerfully at the ends—the four corners—by being interlocked into deep notches; upon these solid, heavy logs was laid, inside and out, a covering of plank: strong sleepers bore up the plank floor, stout rafters held the shingle roof. There you had the main body of the original house, which a partition, running from side to side nearest the western end, cut into two equal parts, the smaller being a bedroom, the larger being the living room, where life on the homestead centered. Springing off from the main roof, other rafters reached downward to rest upon outer plates—forming a shed-roof; the half of this, being closed in with planks, made a shed room: the other half, left unenclosed, but floored, made a back piazza. Two stone chimneys, built outside, gave fireplaces to the living room and to the shed room.

A very unpretentious dwelling you will say, with but four rooms, counting the attic, to which one could climb by dark, corkscrew stairs: but it

did not remain quite so small. After my grandfather had lived in it many years, and had built the fine, two-story barn over on the other side of the Big Road, it seemed high time that he should make some improvement in his dwelling. So it came to pass that two handsome rooms were built in the front of the west end of the old house, forming an "ell" thereto, and connected, by a piazza, to the front piazza of the original dwelling. These new rooms were filled with costly furniture, and were dedicated to the use of "company"—such visitors as might spend the night, or who were not of such familiar footing as to be received into the "living room" of the older house.

My grandfather remained faithful to the older house, spending his days and nights, Sundays and Mondays, winters and summers, in the big sitting room, where he welcomed friends, talked business with his overseer, read his newspapers, and made entries in his "account books."

As I look back to it now, it seems to me that my grandfather's farm must have belonged to another world, so complete have been the changes wrought by two generations. It seems to me that there was neither feverish haste upon it nor vagrant leisure, fretful exaction nor slipshod looseness, miserly gripping nor spendthrift waste. Everything was regular, everything was systematic. A man of settled, thrifty habits, my grandfather had drilled his slaves to his orderly methods, and thus the old routine went on from year to year.

The same slaves allotted to the same tasks, working the same fields with the same tools, raising the same crops in the same way, with never a material change from year to year, naturally gave to the plantation the character of a vast machine, well oiled, well managed, and doing its work without noise or friction—unhasting yet unrelenting, like some steady law of nature. And my grandfather was a farmer! Pretty much everything that he needed was made on the place. There was always corn in the cribs, and some to spare; wheat in the bin, and flour to sell; oats for use and a surplus for market. Every year he slaughtered sixty-odd "fattening" hogs and supplied his plantation with meat and lard. Peas, potatoes, fodder, shucks—he always had more than enough.

My grandfather's house and surroundings were typical of those of middle-class landowners of the old order. What you found in his home you would find in every home of that class. His ways were those of the average man of his state. He was orthodox in politics, took the creed just as he found it; believed what the party leader proclaimed; made no independent research in any direction; and the vitality which he thus saved he expended in raising potatoes, corn, and cotton. He was a "Toombs man"; therefore, I reckon that when Toombs quit the Whig party and joined

the Democrats, whom he had so often vociferously damned, my grandfather changed cars also.

In religion he was a non-combatant, which is saying a good deal, for in those days most men were either rampant Methodists or militant Baptists. . . . He would sit on his front piazza of a Sunday afternoon while neighbor Langford (Methodist) would wrangle with neighbor Cason (Baptist) upon tremendous propositions in theology which neither of them understood (and nobody else, as far as that matters), and he would never chip in a word. . . .

He was no Puritan, my grandfather—only a grave, decorous senior who had been "wild" when he was young, and whose stern features would noticeably relax when some reference was made to his youthful escapades. He took his three drams a day with the patience of a martyr; and, when very angry, would swear with an eloquence that was impressive.

My grandfather was not a literary man, and rarely dipped deeper into a book than was necessary to master the pictures; but yet our bookcase held quite a number of volumes. Of course there was a large family Bible. There was also a fat copy of Watts's Hymns, and the Pilgrim's Progress, and a stray volume of Wesley's Sermons. Georgia Scenes was there, and Simon Suggs; but not Sut Lovingood. We had a handsome Shakespeare, illustrated with steel engravings; a Don Quixote, and a Gil Blas. There were several books of history—State, national, and universal; also Rev. John S. C. Abbott's Life of Napoleon Bonaparte, profusely illustrated. The Ettrick Shepherd (James Hogg) had strayed, by some mysterious chance, into my grandfather's bookcase, where its wrinkled green covers touched Parson Brownlow's Great Iron Wheel Examined—a religio-controversial work in which there was a good deal more controversy than religion. Another one of our literary luxuries was Theodosia, Heroine of the Faith; and on the shelf she leaned affectionately against Tom Jones—a scandalous attitude, as I now realize. The Arabian Nights Entertainments we had; likewise Comstock's Philosophy; a Familiar Science; a Georgia Gazetteer; and a liberal supply of Patent Office Reports. I do not think we had a copy of Tupper's Proverbial Philosophy.

As to pictures, I can recall a brilliant Battle of Buena Vista; and a chromo representing Washington, on a white horse, riding into Trenton, his way being strewn with flowers by a larger number of uniformly handsome, buxom girls than I can remember to have ever seen together at one time.

4. *A Small "Plantation."* Mark Twain, who grew up in the slave state of Missouri, described in *Huckleberry Finn* (1884) "one of

those little one-horse cotton plantations" which occur frequently along the Mississippi River.⁴

A rail fence round a two-acre yard; a stile, made out of logs sawed off and up-ended, in steps, like barrels of a different length, to climb over the fence with, and for the women to stand on when they are going to jump onto a horse; some sickly grass-patches in the big yard, but mostly it was bare and smooth, like an old hat with the nap rubbed off; big double log house for the white folk—hewed logs, with the chinks stopped up with mud or mortar, and these mud-stripes been white-washed some time or another; round-log kitchen,

with a big broad, open but roofed passage joining it to the house; log smoke-house back of the kitchen; three little log nigger-cabins in a row t'other side the smoke-house; one little hut all by itself away down against the back fence, and some outbuildings down a piece the other side; ash-hopper, and big kettle to bile soap in, by the little hut; bench by the kitchen door, with a bucket of water and a gourd; hound asleep there, in the sun; more hounds asleep, roundabout; about three shade-trees away off in a corner; some currant bushes and gooseberry bushes in one place by the fence; outside the fence a garden and a water-melon patch; then the cotton fields begin; and after the fields, the woods.

Part II.

SECTIONAL ANTAGONISMS AND ISSUES

The materials in this Problem and the preceding one indicate that there were numerous points of distinction between the North, the West, and the South. Some of these, especially the physical and economic differences, were tangible and hardly open to dispute; others, particularly those concerned with social attitudes or traits of the people, were less tangible and may be debated. But in either case certain distinctions existed and in connection with these antagonisms grew up. It would be difficult to say whether this arose from the tendency of groups to disapprove customs and institutions unlike their own or from an actual clash of interests in which the advantage of one group meant the disadvantage of the other. Be that as it may, a situation developed where the sections began to lose sight of the reciprocal usefulness that might result from diversity and instead to emphasize points of difference as points of incompatibility. These attitudes did not directly threaten the American union, but they stimulated dissatisfaction, and, if exaggerated to a certain degree, they would be serious enough to threaten it.

An examination of these criticisms and antagonisms is now in order. It will involve, first, a consideration of how the people of each section regarded the people of the other and, second, a review of the major political questions on which the sections believed their interests to be in conflict. Discussion of the question of slavery is left until the next Problem.

A.

AS OTHERS SEE US

In one of his famous breakfast-table conversations, Oliver Wendell Holmes remarked that when two persons converse there are really six parties involved. There are the two actual individuals, but each is speaking not for himself as he is but for himself as he believes himself to be and addressing his arguments not to the real person but to the other person as he imagines him. This distinction, although theoretical, may have the most concrete results if the first person makes a remark that would please the interlocutor of his imagination but displeases the real one.

Both international and intersectional transactions constantly face this difficulty. Beliefs motivate action as much as realities, and, if one group formulates beliefs about another, it may act on its convictions and not on the facts. With this in mind, we must mark as part of the growth of sectionalism the adoption in each section of a more or less fixed view as to the qualities of the other. These views are presented in selections which indicate rather briefly the social distrust existing at one time between North and West and which develop in more detail the deep-seated cleavage that had evolved between the society and social values of the North and those of the South. In scrutinizing these interpretations of one section by another, it is worth while to consider whether they achieve their disparaging

effect by the use of falsehood or merely by the selection and emphasis of points that are valid in a limited sense. It is also important to consider whether the sections agreed on what qualities were desirable and disagreed on which possessed them, or whether they agreed on what qualities each possessed and disagreed on what was desirable. In other words, is the issue a question of fact as to what social traits prevail in a given region, or is it a question of values, as to what traits are socially desirable?

1. *Eastern Views of the Frontier*. A selection from Timothy Flint in Problem IV (p. 118) suggested that the frontiersmen of the early West did not enjoy a good reputation among the more settled citizens of the Atlantic seaboard. The validity of the suggestion is evident from some remarks on the "foresters" or pioneers made by Timothy Dwight in a volume of travels, published four years after his death in 1817.⁵

. . . those, who are first inclined to emigrate, are usually such, as have met with difficulties at home. These are commonly joined by persons, who, having large families, and small farms, are induced, for the sake of settling their children comfortably, to seek for new and cheaper lands. To both are always added the discontented, the enterprising, the ambitious, and the covetous. Many, of the first, and some, of all these classes, are found in every new American country, within ten years after its settlement has commenced. From this period, kindred, friendship, and former neighborhood, prompt others to follow them. Others, still, are allured by the prospect of gain, presented in every new country to the sagacious, from the purchase and sale of lands: while not a small number are influenced by the brilliant stories, which every where are told concerning most tracts during the early progress of their settlement.

A considerable part of all those, who *begin* the cultivation of the wilderness, may be denominated *foresters*, or *Pioneers*. The business of these persons is no other than to cut down trees, build log-houses, lay open forested grounds to cultivation, and prepare the way for those who come after them. These men cannot live in regular society. They are too idle; too talkative; too passionate; too prodigal; and too shiftless; to acquire either property or character. They are impatient of the restraints of law, religion, and morality; grumble about the taxes by which Rulers, Ministers, and School-masters are supported; and complain incessantly, as well as bitterly, of the extortions of mechanics, farmers, merchants, and physicians; to whom they are always indebted. At the same time, they are usually possessed, in their own view, of uncommon wisdom; understand medical science, politics, and religion, better than those, who have studied them through life; and, although they manage their own concerns worse than any other men, feel perfectly

satisfied, that they could manage those of the nation far better than the agents, to whom they are committed by the public. After displaying their own talents, and worth; after censuring the weakness, and wickedness, of their superiors; after exposing the injustice of the community in neglecting to invest persons of such merit with public offices; in many an eloquent harangue, uttered by many a kitchen fire, in every blacksmith's shop, and in every corner of the streets; and finding all their efforts vain; they become at length discouraged: and under the pressure of poverty, the fear of a gaol, and the consciousness of public contempt, leave their native places, and betake themselves to the wilderness.

Here they are obliged either to work, or starve. They accordingly cut down some trees and girdle others; they furnish themselves with an ill-built log-house, and a worse barn; and reduce a part of the forest into fields, half-enclosed and half-cultivated. The forests furnish browse; and their fields yield a stinted herbage. On this scanty provision they feed a few cattle: and with these, and the penurious products of their labour, eked out by hunting and fishing, they keep their families alive.

A farm, thus far cleared, promises immediate subsistence to a better husbandman. A log-house, thus built, presents, when repaired with moderate exertions, a shelter for his family. Such a husbandman is therefore induced by these little advantages, where the soil and situation please him, to purchase such a farm; when he would not plant himself in an absolute wilderness. The proprietor is always ready to sell: for he loves this irregular, adventurous, half-working, and half-lounging life; and hates the sober industry, and prudent economy, by which his bush pasture might be changed into a farm, and himself raised to thrift and independence. . . .

The class of men who have been the principal subject of these remarks, have already straggled onward from New-England, as well as from other parts of the Union, to Louisiana. In a political view, their emigration is of very serious utility to the ancient settlements. All countries contain restless inhabitants; men impatient of labour; men, who will contract debts without intending to pay them; who had rather talk than work; whose vanity persuades them, that they are wise, and prevents them from knowing, that they are fools; who are delighted with innovation; who think

places of power and profit due to their peculiar merits: who feel, that every change from good order and established society will be beneficial to themselves; who have nothing to lose, and therefore expect to be gainers by every scramble; and who, of course, spend life in disturbing others, with the hope of gaining something for themselves. Under despotic governments they are awed into quiet; but in every free community they create, to a greater or less extent, continual turmoil; and have often overturned the peace, liberty, and happiness, of their fellow-citizens. . . .

The institutions, and the habits of New-England, more I suspect than those of any other country, have prevented, or kept down, this noxious disposition; but they cannot entirely prevent either its existence, or its effects. In mercy, therefore, to the sober, industrious, and well-disposed inhabitants, Providence has opened in the vast Western wilderness a retreat, sufficiently alluring to draw them away from the land of their nativity. We have many troubles even now: but we should have many more, if this body of foresters had remained at home.

2. *Frontier Views of the East.* Among the historic figures who personified the American frontier, none—not even Daniel Boone nor Lincoln in his rail-splitting phase—was more characteristic than Davy Crockett of Tennessee. In life Crockett was a “homespun” frontiersman, who capitalized on his coonskin qualities to secure election to Congress and who perished at the Alamo. In legend he became an epic backwoodsman, who could “run faster, jump higher, dive deeper, and come up drier” than anyone else. In 1835, Crockett described the prevailing attitude in the West toward the Yankees of New England.⁶

I have been brought to reflect on times that have gone by, and review a prejudice that has grown up with me, as well as thousands of my western and southern friends. We have always been taught to look upon the people of New England as a selfish, cunning set of fellows, that was fed on fox ears and thistle tops; that cut their wisdom-teeth as soon as they were born; that made money by their wits, and held on to it by natur; that called cheaterly mother-wit; that hung on to political power because they had numbers; that raised up manufactures to keep down the South and West; and, in fact, had so much of the devil in all their machinery, that they would neither lead nor drive, unless the load was going into their own cribs.

3. *Southern Opinion of the North.* In January 1860 *De Bow's Review*, a leading southern

monthly, discussed “The Basis of Northern Hostility to the South.” The article began by suggesting that southern and northern dissimilarities originated in colonial times with the differences between Cavalier stock, which settled in Virginia, and Puritan stock, which settled in New England.⁷

The cavaliers and puritans of that age were undoubtedly the ancestors, and, to a great extent, the *prototypes* of this. That the puritan was unfit for rational freedom, civil or religious, was sufficiently proved by the wild extremity of his principles going to the subversion of all society; by the fierce fanatic intolerance of his opinions; and by the short duration of his power when attained; that the Northern Yankee now is unfit for rational liberty, civil or religious, is even yet more abundantly verified in the still wilder extremes of his social, moral, and political heresies, tending to a yet more complete subversion of society and overthrow of the moral government of God. The puritan hatred of the cavaliers was deep and bitter, but neither deeper nor more bitter than that of the mass of the Northern, for the people of the Southern States, especially that portion of the North known as New-England.

The cavaliers had many human failings; they were, indeed, of the earth, earthy; they fought, they drank, they swore, and they loved, as better men will neither fight, nor drink, nor swear, nor love—but they made no pretence to unusual sanctity, and they were a gallant, high-spirited, chivalrous, and generous race, of the pure Anglo-Saxon blood; and to this day their descendants compose the only really free portion of the English people. They were brave, honorable, social; loyal to their king, and loyal to the church. Knowing that earth could not be made a paradise, they did not, therefore, seek to turn the fair footstool of God into a gloomy hell. Failings they had, but dishonor, sordid meanness, and mammon worship, they knew not; and they served their king and their church, with a loyal devotion that history has seldom paralleled. Their intellectual development was then not surpassed in Europe, and their moral culture was at least equal to that of their age. The puritan side of the picture was a revolting contrast. All was moral deformity and hideous gloom. The English puritans proper were among the very worst developments of human nature—excelled by the French Jacobins only, in the extent of power achieved, and in rapidity and energy of action. The puritan revolution was a politico-religious fanaticism, that of the Jacobins, anti-religious; but extremes meet, and these were not far asunder. Misanthropy, hypocrisy, diseased philanthropy, envy, hatred, fanaticism, and all the worst passions of the human heart, were the ruling

characteristics of the English puritans; and they continue to be the ruling characteristics of New-England Yankees, with the difference, that these have passed from the religious to the anti-religious extreme, and are now as much a people of infidels, as the French of 1793. Many of the puritans were hypocrites, who, to glut their hatred and envy of all who were nobler and better than they, assumed and desecrated the name of religion; part were misanthropes, who, under the cover of religious fanaticism, sought to wreak their hatred of humanity. . . .

But it is in our intellectual, especially in our social and moral development, that we have risen infinitely above them. The people of the Southern States are, by nature eminently conservative, though steady and rationally progressive; and the very structure of our society, embodying, as it does, the divinely sanctioned enslavement of an inferior race, checks all that tendency to licentious anarchy so natural to enlarged freedom, and forces it within due bounds. Our social system is founded entirely on the revealed laws of God; the Bible is the source of all our law, as well social as civil; and hence reverence and worship of its divine and triune Author is more general among us than almost any other people. Entirely satisfied and happy in our Bible and society, we have no incentive, even were we naturally inclined, to run off into wild speculative theories not sanctioned by either that society or that Bible. Does our Bible teach us that God has cursed and enslaved the race of Ham for his own wise purposes, we do not, therefore, interpose our philanthropy and question the wisdom and justice of God. Does it teach us that God has sanctioned the temperate use of wine, we do not in its face declare that to be a sin, and seek to prohibit by our laws, what God has approved. Political and social equality among ourselves is all that we claim or expect in this world, and these we have to a degree absolutely unknown at the North, where the poor are really slaves and the rich are masters. Is one of us rich and the other poor, we do not therefore seek by some Fourierism to level all men, but strive to better our own lot without injuring our neighbors'. Do we see our neighbors of the North possessing more telegraphs and railroads than we, we do not therefore envy them, and begin immediately to speculate upon the morality and policy of railroads and telegraphs, nor do we straightway imagine ourselves the world's reformers and seek to abolish them. Does our Bible tell us to love God, and our neighbors as ourselves, we do not therefore resolve ourselves into a committee of reformation, and proceed to judge and reform all the world around us. Are we told to "love one another," we do not, therefore, abandon the marriage relation and form

ourselves into societies where men and women mingle promiscuously, and "free-love" without check or restraint. The honor of the female sex is dearer to us than money or life, and we guard the marriage relation as zealously as we guard our religion, of which, indeed, it is a part. There is no surer evidence of the great demoralization of the Northern, especially New-England society, than the degradation to which the gentler sex is reduced. There is there no chivalrous devotion to the weak and helpless female, no generous and manly protection of her, but all is calculating, cold, and heartless, as the metal they worship.

4. *A Northern View of the South.* The character of the southern planter class as it seemed to many northerners is shown in a discussion written in 1840 by the historian and anti-slavery leader Richard Hildreth of Massachusetts.⁸

Soldiers possess a free and self-confident air, and when among friends and not irritated or opposed, they exhibit a frank, good humor, an easy, companionable, disposition, which renders their society agreeable, and causes their company to be generally courted. Their military duties often leave them an abundance of leisure; for long intervals, they often have nothing to do but to seek amusement, and they give a warm and hearty welcome to all who are disposed to join and aid them in that pursuit.

These same traits of manners are sufficiently conspicuous among the privileged class of our southern aristocracies. Though a large portion of that class is destitute of education, and of any real refinement, yet almost every member of it has more or less, a certain patrician bearing, a consciousness of his own superiority which gives him an air of manliness and dignity, but which it must be confessed, degenerates too often into rudeness and braggadocio. The wealthier and better educated, passing almost the whole of their lives in a round of social pleasures, have attained to a considerable perfection in the art of pleasing; and those who visit the southern states of the Union for the first time, are generally captivated by the politeness, the hospitality, the attentions, the good humor of the people.

Manners however are far from being any certain index of character, and they are often carried to a high pitch of refinement, in cases where all the virtues which they seem to indicate, are lamentably deficient.

The soldier nursed in blood and robbery, however mildly and gently he conducts himself, is at best, only a tame tiger, not rashly to be trusted. His passions are violent and unmanageable, accustomed to indulgence, and impatient of control. It is the same with the slave-master. Habit-

ated to play the tyrant at home, unshackled regent and despotic lord upon his own plantation, where his wish, his slightest whim is law, the love of domineering, possesses all his heart. The intercourse of society has taught him the policy and the advantages of mutual concession in little things, and the trifling points of ordinary politeness he yields with the ready willingness of a well-bred man. Beyond this he is not to be trusted. Alarm his prejudices, his self-love, his jealousy, his avarice, his ambition; cross his path in any shape whatever; assume the character of a rival or a censor; presume to doubt his perfect wisdom and immaculate virtue; and from a laughing, good natured companion, he is changed at once, into a fierce, furious, raving and raging enemy. He boils and almost bursts with passion: he answers argument with invective; instead of reasons, he replies to you with insults. Not content to restrain his hate within the usual limits of civilized life, he thirsts for your blood. He murders you in a duel; assaults you in the streets with pistols and Bowie knife; or deliberately shoots you from the door of his house, with a double-barrelled gun. The fear of the law does not restrain him. In the southern states, a *gentleman* is never hung. The most cold-blooded and deliberate murderers, in the upper classes of society, escape with a fine or a short imprisonment. The gallows is reserved for abolitionists, negro-stealers, and *poor* white folks.

I. The condition of society in the southern states, even among the most refined and best educated portion of the people, exhibits frightful evidences of FEROCITY OF TEMPER, such as a state of everlasting war might be expected to produce. Thucydides remarks, that from the time the Athenians laid aside the custom of going armed, civility and refinement began to make a steady progress among them. This is a point to which the people of the southern states have not yet attained. They generally carry arms; but the pistols, knives and dirks, their favorite weapons, are of a kind more fit for foot-pads and assassins, than for well-intentioned citizens. In several of the states it has been attempted to suppress by penal enactments this barbarous practice of carrying deadly weapons. These laws are never enforced, and it is scarcely possible they should be. To carry arms in the state of things existing at the south, seems absolutely necessary. . . . The atrocity of southern duels has long been notorious, —but what duel can be compared with those “*rencontres*” of which we so often read accounts in the southern papers,—accounts which among the peoples of those states seem to carry with them all the interest of a bull-baiting or a cock-fight,—in which two men or more, armed to the teeth, meet in the streets, at a *court-house* or a tavern,

shoot at each other with pistols, then draw their knives, close, and roll upon the ground, covered with dust and blood, struggling and stabbing till death, wounds, or the submission of one of the parties, put an end to the contest? These scenes, which if they take place at the north at all, appear but once an age, and then only among the lowest and most depraved of the emigrant population, are of frequent and almost daily occurrence at the south, among those who consider themselves the most respectable people. Andrew Jackson, late president of the United States, and regarded as a most illustrious citizen, has been engaged in several such affrays.

II. IMPROVIDENCE is a vice of the most dangerous character. The ancients were so impressed with the multitudinous evils and miseries to which it gives occasion, that they raised *prudence* to the dignity of one of the four cardinal virtues. Improvidence is however a failing, which is apt to prevail to a great extent in a slaveholding community. The careless, headlong rapidity with which a planter spends his money, is proverbial. This childish profusion has even been raised among them to the rank of a virtue; it is described as the mark of a noble minded man; while economy is decried and stigmatized as mean and little. . . .

III. IDLENESS, says the copy book, is the mother of all vices. If any one doubt the truth of this ancient and homely maxim, to be convinced of it, he need only spend a year or two in the south. He will find a great many idle people there. Almost all the owners of slaves have hardly any occupation except to amuse themselves. Born and bred to this occupation they become incapable of any other. One would suppose that having so much leisure time, they might turn their attention to the study of agriculture, an art upon which so wholly depends not their private income only, but the public wealth of the communities to which they belong. But no,—they have no taste for such pursuits, and they leave the management of their plantations, entirely to their overseers. . . .

Thus freed from all the cares of business, it might be imagined that the wealthy slave-masters of the south, would bestow their time and thoughts upon the pursuit of knowledge, the cultivation of literature, and the agreeable arts. . . .

In these expectations we are totally disappointed. Books are a rare commodity at the south; literature is uncommon and science still more so. Libraries, whether public or private, are seldom to be met with. . . .

To obtain some relief from the weariness that constantly besets them, the planters seek to divert and occupy their thoughts by social intercourse. This is the origin of that *hospitality* for which the people of the south are so famous, and which

is often brought forward as a virtue ample enough to cover the acknowledged multitude of their sins. Hospitality, it is true, bears a certain relation to benevolence; but it is to benevolence no more than is the flounce to the garment. . . . Hospitality has ever been a virtue abundantly practised among all idle and indolent races. The Indian tribes of America, are all celebrated for its exercise. The plundering Arabs of the desert look upon it as a religious duty,—for conscience and inclination are always apt to pull together. . . .

The Hospitality of the South, not only stimulates improvidence, it is the nursing mother of the vice of DRUNKENNESS, which prevails throughout the whole country to a frightful extent. Dinner parties end too often in general intoxication. What is called the *Temperance Reform*, has made but trifling progress in the slaveholding states. The obstacles in its way are immense. To drink is absolutely necessary as a means of killing time. Among the lower orders of the privileged class, every social meeting ends in drunkenness. Attend an election, and by the time the polls are closed, you will find a great collection of citizens at the place of voting, all or most of them, "gloriously drunk." Stay long enough and you will see a fight. . . .

But such is the total stagnation of intellect and sentiment at the south, that even the stimulus of intoxicating liquors is not enough to give life and zest to social intercourse. There is need of more potent means. Necessity is the mother of invention. That means is at hand. It is GAMING. . . .

Yet notwithstanding all the horror, with which this vice of gambling is regarded, the indulgence in it, at least among the men, is next to universal. The two present senators from Kentucky [1840] are men of whose talents any country might be proud. But a few years since they were both as much celebrated for a reckless spirit of gambling, as they were then and still are, for patriotism and ability. When such men lead, followers are always plenty. Every little village of the south has its race-course, its billiard room, its faro table, and its gambling house, and of the three latter, perhaps several. . . . Men, in all ages, and in every country, who have had much leisure on their hands, which they know not how else to employ, have ever sought relief in some sort of gambling. It is so always with savages, sailors and soldiers, and so it is with the idle population of the south. The habit once acquired, it becomes almost impossible to resist its seductions. To reform a gambler is much the same difficult task as to reform a drunkard. The planter who has been secluded upon his estate for a week or a month, in irksome and wretched indolence, his heart all the time devouring itself, orders his horse or his carriage in a fit of desperation, and sets out for the nearest village. The gaming table offers him the speediest and most certain means of excitement, the surest method of shaking off the listless misery which oppresses him. To the gaming table he goes. It stands always ready,—for the necessity of the case has created a peculiar class of men at the south, who are gamblers by profession.

B. ISSUES OF SECTIONAL CONFLICT

Distrust and misunderstanding between sections as between nations are always pregnant with danger, but immediate danger appears when sectional prejudices become involved in political questions. So long as mere questions of self-esteem are involved, two localities may disparage each other without seriously harmful results, but if the two disagree on a public question their general dislike for each other tends to make their disagreement far more bitter than it would be if only the merits of the question were involved. Political questions serve as catalytic agents, precipitating all generalized, vaguely felt sectional feeling.

Everyone knows that there was one great sectional issue in American politics in the period with which we are dealing—slavery. Indeed, it is often supposed that sectionalism was the slavery question and that the slavery question was sectionalism. Slavery was of vital importance and will receive full attention later, but the fallacy of regarding it as the whole essence of sectionalism is evident from the fact that sectional questions still arise in the United States today, more than eighty years since slavery ceased to exist.

In reality there were a number of other sectional questions besides slavery in the period before the Civil War. These may be summarized in connection with four major economic issues: (1) Foremost was the tariff issue; but in addition to the conflict over this there was also friction on the question of (2) establishing a centralized monetary system through the instrumentality of a federally chartered Bank of the United States. Contests also arose over (3) the question of federal appropriations for building turnpikes and canals (internal improvements) and (4) the question of distributing government-owned lands at low or

nominal cost. A sequence of selections will explain why each of these questions tended to cause a division along sectional lines, but the student is left to draw his own conclusions as to the completeness, in actuality, of the sectional demarcation. As a means of testing this alignment, tables are given showing how the members from each state voted in Congress on critical bills which involved each one of these four questions.

1. *The Tariff.* A clear, penetrating statement as to the sectional aspects of the tariff question is given in Charles A. and Mary R. Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization*.⁹

In this clash of sectional interests, the outstanding issue of the middle period was the tariff. From it sprang nullification in South Carolina and South Carolina finally led the way into secession. In general it was the representatives of the manufacturing group who fostered the demand for protection and showed the greatest facility in gathering recruits for that cause in national elections. On the whole, opposition to protection and support for free trade, or at all events low rates of duty, came from the agricultural and importing interests.

Yet the matter, as already indicated, was by no means simple. Every revenue law imposing taxes on goods coming into the United States was a complex of many items arranged under several separate schedules—a complex which in practice reflected the demands of many groups and factions, sometimes even conciliating opposing interests by compensatory favors of real or dubious utility. In these circumstances, American political society presented revolving kaleidoscopic patterns whenever the revenue question was up for controversy. Woolen manufacturers and sheep raisers might be united by a tariff that protected both cloth and raw wool but sent flying asunder by hardware schedules. Hemp and flax growers burned brown under blazing suns might be made to feel a common cause with steel and iron magnets bleached white in shaded offices. Nevertheless two powerful agricultural groups, cotton and tobacco growers, supplemented by corn raisers, provided a fairly consistent leadership for a relentless war against this the general principle of protection for manufactures.

Five times between 1830 and 1860 the tariff was revised, showing on the whole a downward tendency. A sliding-scale cut was made in 1833 . . . under a threat of revolution on the part of South Carolina's planters, and, when, nearly ten years later, the Whigs with aid from the opposition forced the duties upward again, the champions of low tariffs swept the polls in the election of 1844. Then the tide definitely turned, the Democratic party under southern leadership driving the country steadily in the direction of free trade until the grand climax of 1860. By the tariff act of 1846, Congress struck a smashing blow at

the protective system, the members of the South and West being in the vanguard of the majority that did the terrible execution; of the ninety-three votes against the measure in the House, New England and the Middle States furnished sixty-three.

As this law soon brought a surplus into the Treasury, triumphant Democracy delivered another savage thrust in 1857 making the rates still lower—in actual operation below the figures set in the famous compromise of 1833. Though the vote on this bill in the House seemed to reveal a confused state of public opinion in the large, it betrayed unmistakable tendencies. Members from the South and Southwest cast sixty votes for the measure and but two against it. More salient still was the fact that the West and Northwest furnished thirty-three votes against tariff reduction and only fourteen for it. The South was now almost solid; the West was evidently swinging away from its old moorings and was in a mood for a new political combination—one so adroitly effected at Chicago in 1860.

In the course of the long conflict over the tariff, statesmen from the South worked out a positive theory as to its practical effect on the distribution of wealth. The creed was perfectly formulated in a logical fashion by Senator McDuffie of South Carolina as early as 1830, all elaborations by those who followed in his footsteps being merely fine glosses on his protocol. In the Senator's own words, the argument ran as follows: "Owing to the federative character of our Government, the great geographical extent of our territory, and the diversity of the pursuits of our citizens in different parts of the Union, it has so happened that two great interests have sprung up, standing directly opposed to each other." The first of these interests embraces the manufacturers who cannot thrive in the face of European competition without protection and subsidies from the government; the second is composed of the producers of agricultural staples in the South—staples that can find a market only in foreign countries and can be advantageously sold "only in exchange for the foreign manufactures which come into competition with those of the Northern and Middle States. . . . These interests then stand diametrically and irreconcilably opposed to each other. The interest, the pecuniary interest, of the Northern manufacturer is directly promoted by every increase of the taxes imposed on Southern commerce; and it is unnecessary to add that the inter-

est of the Southern planter is promoted by every diminution of the taxes imposed on the productions of his industry."

Thus the southern statesman reduced this phase of the political struggle of the middle period to its final terms: a conflict over the distribution of wealth. The planter desired a public policy that put money into his pocket, or, to use his customary language, enabled him to keep it there; the manufacturer of the North clamored for a policy that transferred it into his own. In McDuffie's mind it was the old and simple plan of getting and keeping; no political litany could obscure the issue for the initiates. Within two decades, practically all the statesmen of the planting interest were unreservedly committed to the Senator's faith.

No mere academic theory was this concept of the political battle. Statisticians of the South even tried to visualize it in terms of dollars and cents by figuring out to the exact amount of "tribute" paid by the planting class to the capitalists of the North. In that calculation they estimated that forty million dollars in round numbers had been poured into the coffers of northern shipowners by 1850 in the form of freight rates. Finding that southern exports amounted to about one hundred millions annually, they came to the conclusion that this enormous sum was in fact lent without interest to northern merchants for use in the manipulation of foreign and domestic exchanges. The toll levied on the South by machine industry, they thought, was especially burdensome. "Were she to work up her 2,500,000 bales of cotton," exclaimed a southern economist, "and receive the profit of \$40 each, she would realize 70 to 100 millions annually."

2. *A Central Banking System.* As part of his financial program as first Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton had chartered in 1791, a central banking institution, the Bank of the United States. This bank had the power to issue notes which circulated as money and also enjoyed the exclusive handling of federal funds. But instead of being owned and operated by the government, it was privately owned by stockholders and operated for the profit of the owners. This bank failed to secure a recharter when its original twenty-year grant expired in 1811, but a second Bank of the United States was established in 1816 for another twenty years, before the end of which time Andrew Jackson prevented a renewal of the charter.

In general, the Northeast supported the Bank and the South and West opposed it. Some of the opponents of the Bank were believers in a system of "hard" money (gold

and silver) and distrusted any issue of paper notes. Others accepted and even welcomed the practice of issuing notes but objected to the central bank because it was able to impose its policies on local banks throughout the country, using this power to prevent them from issuing notes in a volume high in proportion to their assets. In regions which lacked capital, such limitations led to an insufficiency of currency. Furthermore, most of the Bank's stock was owned in the centers of capital in the East, and opponents of the Bank felt that this resulted in absentee control of the finances of the hinterland and in operations which exploited the economy of poorly capitalized areas.

The sectional aspects of the bank question are discussed by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., in his *The Age of Jackson*. This discussion shows (1) the importance in sectional contests of immediate economic advantage rather than of abstract principle and (2) the presence of factors which prevented the question from being purely sectional. Schlesinger begins by observing that some of the leaders in the war against the Bank were advocates of the hard money school of economics.¹⁰

The ordinary follower of Jackson in the West also regarded the Bank with strong latent antagonism, but for very different reasons. Its policy in 1819 of recalling specie and checking the note issue of state banks had gained it few friends in any class, and, in Kentucky especially, the Relief War kept resentments alive. But this anti-Bank feeling owed little to reasoned distrust of paper money or to a Jeffersonian desire for specie. As a debtor section the West naturally preferred cheap money; and Kentucky, for example, which most vociferously opposed the United States Bank, also resorted most ardently to wildcat banking of its own. The crux of the Kentucky fight against the Bank was not the paper system, but outside control: the Bank's sin lay not in circulating paper money itself, but in restraining its circulation by Kentucky banks. Almost nowhere, apart from doctrinaires like Jackson and Benton, did Westerners object to state banks under local control.

Indeed, during the eighteen-twenties, even the Philadelphia Bank to a considerable degree overcame the Western prejudices against it. In Tennessee, for example, until 1829 "both [Governor William] Carroll and the legislature favored federal as well as state banks, nor does anything in the history of the state indicate that there was any general feeling against such institutions before Jackson became President." Caleb Atwater, a lusty Jackson man from Ohio and something of a professional Westerner, expressed a widespread feel-

ing when he wrote in 1831. "Refuse to re-charter the bank, and Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Louisville, St. Louis, Nashville, and New Orleans, will be crushed at one blow." . . .

Some writers have talked of frontier life as if it bred traits of "individualism" and equality which made Westerners mystically opposed to banks. Actually, like all other groups in the population, Westerners favored banks when they thought they could profit by them and fought them when they thought others were profiting at their expense. The Western enthusiasm for an assault on the Bank came, not from an intuitive democratic *Weltschmerz* born in the American forest, nor from a Jeffersonian dislike of banks, but from a farmer-debtor desire to throw off restraints on the local issue of paper money.

Similar objections to control from Philadelphia ranged many Easterners against the Bank. State institutions hoped, by falling heir to the government deposits, to enlarge their banking capital, at no expense to themselves. Special grievances multiplied the motives. The state banks of New York, for example, envied the United States Bank . . . New York City had long resented the choice of Philadelphia as the nation's financial capital. Thus in a fight against the Bank Jackson could expect the backing of a decent minority of the local banking interests.

But there was still another and more reliable source of support. In March, 1829, after the grim depression winter, a group of Philadelphia workmen, under the very shadow of the Bank, called a meeting "opposed to the chartering of any more new banks." The hard times were blamed upon the "too great extension of paper credit."

3. *Internal Improvements: The Early Period.* For almost twenty years after the establishment of the government under the Constitution, the financing and construction of facilities for transportation was regarded as the business of state or local authorities and not of the central government. In 1806, however, Jefferson, who had adopted more nationalistic ideas since becoming President, recommended that the Constitution be amended to permit Congress to support a national system of roads and canals. This was followed by a report in 1808 by Albert Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury, outlining a program of such improvements. At that time Congress had already voted funds for the Cumberland Pike (or National Road), and in 1816 this roadway was opened from Baltimore to Wheeling on the Ohio.

Thereafter enthusiasts for the program attempted to drive ahead on a broad basis and to enact measures which were constitutionally

less vulnerable than the Cumberland Road measure, which had been executed through agreements with the states. Henry Clay became the spokesman of a proposed "American system," intended to link the internal-improvement question with the tariff question. Clay argued that the tariff would aid eastern industrial centers and the internal-improvement program would aid western grain-producing areas, each thus becoming a market for the goods of the other. The Bank question, too, was linked with the tariff and internal improvement questions, for in 1816, when the incorporators of the second Bank of the United States paid the government a "bonus" of \$1,500,000 for their charter, nationalists at once secured the passage in Congress of a bonus bill to spend this windfall for roads and canals. Madison vetoed the measure and the veto was upheld, but the contest between advocates and opponents of public aid to transportation has continued ever since. In 1831 Jackson's veto of the Maysville Turnpike Bill marked a setback for the advocates of national aid, but the grants for Pacific railroads in the 1860s and 1870s revived the internal-improvement idea on an epic scale, and river and harbor bills have kept it alive in recent decades.

Sectional aspects of the internal-improvement question were discussed in 1916 in a monograph by Homer C. Hockett. This discussion was especially concerned with showing how in the time of Jefferson the identity of interests of the South and West had caused all political elements to fuse into one national party (Era of Good Feelings) and how the divergence of these same interests through new economic developments tore the national party into antagonistic factions. The selection quoted here bears especially upon the internal-improvement question but shows how inseparable this question was in actuality from the tariff. Hockett introduces the subject by showing how, in the early stages of settlement, the isolation of the West had led it to strive for economic diversity and regional self-sufficiency.¹¹

But the hope of western self-sufficiency could not be made a reality. . . . [The] abundance of cheap land was the lure which drew the great majority of the newcomers, and despite the notable growth of manufacturing activity it did not keep pace with the expansion of agriculture. . . . [At] no time did the surplus find the local market sufficient, and the desire for an adequate market made war upon the ideal of self-sufficiency. In spite of the obstacle of distance, almost from

the beginning the surplus flour, grain, tobacco, and meat of Kentucky sought an outlet by way of the Mississippi to the West Indies and Europe, and from an early date grain found a way out also in the form of easily transported whiskey. Cattle and hogs, too, could be driven across the mountains, and this phase of western commerce became of great volume. Up the river came specie in payment for these exports, and notwithstanding the heavy cost of transportation, over the rough mountain roads lumbering wagons carried many imports to fill the debit side of the trade account. But the disadvantage under which the West carried on all trade with distant parts even of the United States may be seen from the cost of freight. To eastern Ohio the rates overlaid from Philadelphia and Baltimore, and by way of the Mississippi from New Orleans, were about the same, averaging nearly \$7 per hundred weight. Such rates forbade the transportation of bulky articles by land to the cities of the Atlantic coast. Down river freights were much lower, and yet at times prohibitive in view of prices obtainable for produce in the New Orleans market. The obstacles to river navigation resulted in an alternate dearth and glut of the market, attended by great fluctuations in prices and misleading quotations. The bulk of the exports of the upper valley regularly arrived at about the same time, with the spring rise of the water, and often so depressed the market as to occasion loss to the shippers. Even these precarious trade opportunities were accessible only to those whose farms lay near navigable streams, for the cost of carrying grain over unimproved country roads consumed its value in a short haul.

The cost of transportation reduced the price of all western exports and increased that of all imports. The disadvantage of the West in such exchange was reduced by contemporaries to the estimate that it required four bushels of corn to buy at Cincinnati what one bushel would command at Philadelphia.

Yet the abundance of the fruits of the soil seemed to mean the power to command the wealth of the world if the natural impediments to commerce could but be overcome. The one town of Circleville, located near the head of navigation on the Scioto, sent down the river in the year 1822 exports worth approximately one hundred thousand dollars, and according to local opinion, the community could have supplied ten times the amount with proper facilities for transportation. . . .

The obvious remedy seemed to be the improvement of transportation facilities in order that western produce might cheaply reach the distant market. . . .

For the next few years it is doubtful if any sin-

gle policy so united sentiment in the Ohio Valley as the policy of internal improvements. It is the constant theme of editors, newspaper writers, legislators, and governors, who discuss it in all phases, local, state, and national. . . .

Clay and Calhoun, with all their efforts to embrace nation-wide interests in their thought, spoke as exponents of the West; that is, their scheme of national policy fell in with the local interests of the western section. Calhoun, representing a constituency in that piedmont region from which so much of the western population had sprung, and which was in 1816 still partly a region of farms; and Clay, from the state which was the first fruit of the transmontane migration, derived their enthusiasm concerning the nation's future from the very fact that it was developing so rapidly in the West. . . . In all of his advocacy of the American System, in fact, Clay appears to the historian as the champion of the West, engaged in an effort to persuade the other great sections into the belief that their interests are in harmony with his great scheme of policy. The reciprocal relation of the farmer and manufacturer was sufficiently obvious, but in vain did he seek to reconcile the ship owner and the planter to the idea of a national economy. . . .

The key to the national politics of the period 1815-1825 is to be sought in the rivalries and shifting alliances of these interests and of the sections where they centered. The "piedmontese" expansion of this era was a continuation of the movement which had won the early West for Republicanism in its race with the Federalist party. Superficially it seemed to insure the continued dominance of the triumphant party. On the side of party history, then, the meaning of the period is to be sought in an answer to the question, whether the Republican name and organization could continue to hold together . . . the old party elements now so altered in their relations.

A divergent drift of the South and West, both professing the Republican name, became apparent while Madison was still president. With a regard for the letter of the constitution worthy of the original traditions of the party, he vetoed the Bonus Bill, a measure inspired in part by his own recommendation of the policy of internal improvements. Monroe, following in his footsteps, announced to Congress in his first message his disbelief in their right to promote such works without an amendment altering the constitution.

. . . behind Presidents Madison and Monroe was the seaboard South, which became the seat of a marked reaction against the nationalism which dominated the country at the opening of the era, the seat of a revived insistence upon sectional interests and state rights. This reaction had its main-spring in antagonism to the American System

and the nationalism toward which the West was so steadily tending.

The cotton-raising region was hopelessly out of the range of the benefits expected from the development of the home market. In 1816 the argument for protection to develop home manufactures of necessities as a means of national defence won a measure of acquiescence in the South. Lowndes, of South Carolina, as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, introduced the tariff bill of that year, and it had no more ardent supporter in any section than Calhoun. The South cast twenty-three votes in favor of the bill. Two members of the South Carolina delegation besides Lowndes and Calhoun supported it on its passage. Yet these lost their seats at the next election, and Calhoun was charged by residents of his district with having sacrificed his state to his presidential aspirations. In fact, the South cast thirty-four of the fifty-four votes against the measure, the rest coming from the commercial regions of the northern coast. John Randolph, refusing to be persuaded by the arguments of the nationalists, insisted upon presenting the case in its sectional aspects. "It eventuates in this: whether you, as a planter will consent to be taxed, in order to hire another man to go to work in a shoemaker's shop, or to set up a spinning jenny. For my part I will not agree to it, even though they should, by way of return, agree to be taxed to help us plant tobacco; much less will I agree to pay all, and receive nothing for it. No, I will buy where I can get manufactures cheapest, I will not agree to lay a duty on the cultivators of the soil to encourage exotic manufactures; because, after all, we should only get much worse things at a much higher price, and we, the cultivators of the country, would in the end pay for all." The case of the planter could hardly be more concisely stated, and if he would not sacrifice himself for the good of the whole country, it was not to be expected that he would become reconciled to the protective policy when its aim ceased to be primarily associated with the national defence. In relation to the market at home and abroad the position of the planter was essentially different from that of the farmer. He suffered from no such lack of market in Europe as that which depressed grain farming. On the contrary, as the producer of a raw material which could not be grown in Europe, nor anywhere so advantageously as in the rich, cheap lands of the Gulf Plains, he enjoyed the control of a monopolist over a commodity for which the demand was increasing. While the countries of Europe, adjusting themselves to peace conditions after the downfall of Napoleon, were resuming cultivation and placing restrictions upon the food supplies exported from the United States, they were welcoming southern cotton. . . .

The southern seaboard developed likewise an opposition to the other important feature of the American System, that is, the policy of national aid to internal improvements. Before the spread of the plantation system into the interior of the South Atlantic states, considerable interest had been displayed in local roads and canals to afford access for the farmers of the interior to the seaport towns. Before the close of the eighteenth century, the Santee canal, by connecting Charleston with the river which gave the canal its name, had shortened the distance between the inland farms and the city, affording the one a readier market and the other cheaper supplies. The Chesapeake and Ohio and James River Canal projects were likewise designed to tap the uplands and ultimately the Ohio Valley. But while Baltimore held its own with Philadelphia for a time, the southern states soon fell hopelessly behind the northern in the competition for the trade of the transallegany region. The higher mountains precluded all possibility of canal connection, and not until the advent of the railroad were the conditions north and south somewhat equalized. Meantime, with the advance of staple growing in the interior interest even in the local roads and canals declined in the eastern cotton belt. The marketing of cotton could be done when teams were idle, for the crop did not suffer from long hauls over poor roads. The planters considered the loss of time less serious than the cost of toll on the turnpikes, and the roads constructed at an earlier date fell into disuse during the twenties. The western South showed more interest in the proposals of national turnpikes and improvements in water courses, and as late as 1824 Governor Troup of Georgia wrote to President Monroe urging the claim of his state to a share of the benefit under the survey act, and suggesting canals to connect the Savannah with the Tennessee and the St. Marys with the Suwanee. Tennessee was the scene of similar agitation. In this matter as in the tariff question, the South was not wholly united, but as the association of the two policies in the American System became clear, the seaboard, lacking any positive interest to enlist its support for the policy of improvements, placed both equally under the ban of its disapprobation.

It is clear to the historian that by 1824 the basis of the old party system was gone. . . . The Republicans retained, it is true, the old party name and the semblance of an organization. But the two geographical sections which shared the name were as widely separated as the poles in their views of national policy, in their votes on specific measures, and in their interpretation of the constitution.

4. Internal Improvements: Some Results.

The preceding selection has treated the in-

ternal-improvement question as an issue of government. But quite apart from any political contest over federal policy, internal improvements, once they were constructed either by national or state or private action, exercised a profound influence upon the growth of nationalism and upon the relations of the sections. One of the earliest observers to recognize the importance of these factors was Alexander Mackay, a British traveler who in 1849 described a conversation with an American about the relationship of East and West. In the developments here described one finds a completion of that rearrangement of sectional alliances which began to manifest itself in the period analyzed by Hockett.¹²

"It is a common thing in Europe," said I, "to speculate upon the probabilities of a speedy dissolution between the northern and southern divisions of the Union; but I confess that, for myself, I have for some time back been of opinion that, should a disseverance ever take place, the danger is that it will be between the East and the West."

"On what do you base such an opinion?" inquired my companion.

"On referring to the map," replied I, "it will be found that fully one-third of the members of the confederation are situated in the same great basin, having one great interest in common between them, being irrigated by the same system of navigable rivers, and all united together into one powerful belt by their common artery, the Mississippi."

"Admitting this," observed my friend, "what danger arises therefrom to the stability of the Union?"

"Only that arising from a probable conflict of interests," replied I. "The great region drained by the Mississippi is pre-eminently agricultural, whilst much of the sea-board is manufacturing and commercial. The first-named region is being rapidly filled with an adventurous and energetic population; and its material resources are being developed at a ratio unexampled in the annals of human progress. The revolution of a very few years will find it powerful enough to stand by itself, should it feel so inclined, and then nothing can prevent a fatal collision of interests between it and the different communities on the sea-board, but the recognition and adoption of a commercial policy, which will afford it an ample outlet for its vast and varied productions." . . .

"I am free to admit," said my friend, "the necessity for such an adjustment, as an essential condition to the stability of the Union; at the same time, I am sensible of the difficulty of fulfilling that condition, from the character, magnitude, and importance of the interests involved. The exuberant

fertility of the Mississippi valley can scarcely be exaggerated, whilst the tendency of population thither cannot be repressed. An idea may thus be formed of the influence which the great agricultural section of the Union is speedily destined to assume. On the other hand, nearly five hundred millions of dollars have already been invested, east of the Alleghanies, in manufactures. Daily additions are being made to this huge investment; and the miner, the iron master, the woollen manufacturer, and the cotton spinner, are taking rapid strides in extending their operations and enhancing their power. Between two such interests, should a collision arise, the results would be most disastrous. Political considerations would vanish in the contest between material interests, and the framework of the Confederacy might dissolve before the shock. These are the difficulties of the case. Antagonistic as they are in many respects in their interests, were the East and the West to be left physically isolated from each other, the difficulties in the way of a compromise of interests would indeed be insurmountable. Had the East no direct hold upon the West, and had the West no communication with the rest of the world but through the Mississippi, one might well despair of a permanent reconciliation. It is obviating the physical obstructions, which, unremoved, would throw the current of their interests into different directions, that the great barrier to a permanent good understanding between the East and the West has been broken down; it is by rendering each more necessary to the other that the foundation has been laid for that mutual concession, which alone can ensure future harmony and give permanence to the Union."

"And how have you done this?" inquired I.

"We have tapped the West," replied he. . . .

"By tapping the West, then, you mean opening direct communications between the East and the West?"

"Exactly so," said he. "Had matters been left as nature arranged them, the whole traffic of the Mississippi valley would have been thrown upon the Gulf of Mexico. Two classes of considerations impelled us to attempt to obviate this; the first having reference to the interests which the East would subserve in establishing a direct communication with the West; and the second, to the prevention of the inconvenient commercial and political alliances, to which the isolation of the West might have given rise." . . .

"When I consider," said I, "the many parallel lines of artificial communication which you have established between the East and the West, I must say that, in tapping the latter, you have tapped it liberally."

"We have taken, or are taking, advantage of all our opportunities in this respect," replied he.

"Virginia is tapping the West by uniting the Ohio to the Atlantic, by means of the James River and Kanawha canal, constructed in the valley of the river. Maryland is doing the same by this Chesapeake and Ohio canal, which follows the course of the Potomac, and is doubling her hold upon the Mississippi and its tributaries by the Baltimore and Ohio railway, which debouches upon the same valley after first ascending that of the Patapsco from Baltimore. Pennsylvania has tapped the West by means of her double line of railway and canal, descending upon the Ohio after ascending the Susquehanna; and New York, which took the lead in the process, has done the same by directing the waters of Lake Erie through her great canal, along the fertile valley of the Mohawk, to the Hudson, and, consequently, to the Atlantic."

"And to these you look," observed I, "as your securities for the integrity of the republic?"

"As bonds," said he, "the existence of which renders improbable the severance of the East from the West. These four great parallel lines of intercommunication have effectually counteracted the political tendencies of the Mississippi. That bond of political union to the States of the Far West, if not actually broken, is now rendered harmless as regards the safety of the Confederacy, for it is now subsidiary to the ties which unite the great valley to the Atlantic sea-board. An element of weakness has been converted into an element of strength; for as the Mississippi binds together the whole West, so do these gigantic artificial communications inseparably connect the whole West, thus bound together, with the East, by closely identifying the interests of the two. . . .

". . . Every thing, too, which improves the position of the West, as regards the Atlantic seaports, renders the mutual dependence between the two sections of the Union, as respects their home trade, more intimate and complete. In addition to this, it strengthens more and more the sentiment of nationality, by bringing the denizens of the West and the East in constant communication with each other. They freely traverse each other's fields, and walk each other's streets, and feel equally at home, whether they are on the Wabash, the Arkansas, the Potomac, the Susquehanna, the Genesee, or the St. John's. This is what we have effected by tapping the West. We have united it to us by bonds of iron, which it cannot, and which, if it could, it would not break. By binding it to the older States by the strong tie of material interests, we have identified its political sentiment with our own. We have made the twain one by our canals, our railroads, and our electric telegraphs, by making the Atlantic more necessary to the West than the Gulf; in short," said he, "by removing the *Alleganies*."

5. *The Public Land Question.* At the foundation of the American republic, the government's greatest asset consisted in vast tracts of unsettled and unassigned land. From the outset, men of vision foresaw that the provisions for distribution of this land would be one of the most important features of government policy. If the land were held for sale over a very long period at substantial prices, it would provide revenues for the government and would conserve resources for the public. If, on the other hand, the land should be sold to private owners at low or even nominal prices, it would hasten the process of settlement and would strengthen the American democratic system by making property ownership possible for all.

As between these two alternatives the policy of disposing of land quickly and at a low price found favor from the beginning. As early as 1785 Congress provided for a system of rectilinear surveys, parceling the land into townships of six miles square, each township containing thirty-six sections of one square mile each. Thereafter by a series of laws it was made progressively easier for the individual to acquire land from the government. In 1796, single sections of 640 acres (one square mile) could be purchased for \$2 an acre, and the unit of sale was progressively reduced to 320 acres in 1800, 160 acres in 1804, and 80 acres in 1820, while purchase was rendered easier by provisions for installment buying in 1804 and by reduction of the price to \$1.25 per acre in 1820. After 1820, therefore, \$100 would buy the land for an 80-acre farm.

Later the laws were made still more generous. Squatters were given a prior right to purchase the land which they occupied, and in 1862 Congress carried the cheap-land policy to its logical end by adopting the Homestead Act under which anyone might receive a free grant of 160 acres of land if he would live on it and improve it.

The sectional aspects of the public-land question were discussed by Raynor G. Wellington in a monograph in 1914. The following excerpts will show, first, that each of the three major sections manifested a distinctive reaction toward this question, and, second, that as the economic conditions of the sections changed their attitudes toward land, policy was also modified, so that the shifting coalitions on the land question may be compared with those on the question of internal improvements. The latter part of this discussion barely alludes to the important fact that in the last decade preceding the Civil War, the North was prepared to support a

policy of cheap or even free land as the price of western cooperation, and the South was unwilling to continue the support of western policies which would have encouraged the rapid settlement of the West by small farmers without other property—that is, by nonslaveholders.¹³

[*Attitudes of the Sections in 1828.*] The manufacturing North Atlantic States were thoroughly in favor of keeping up the price of public lands. For the promotion of manufactures there were needed a good supply of cheap labor and a protective tariff. The sale of Western lands at low prices attracted a steady stream of emigration from the manufacturing States, and lessened the class of population from which the manufacturers could draw their supply of labor. So they were bitterly opposed to all Western land measures, the success of which would mean decrease in Eastern land values and political strength. Still they were unwilling that the proceeds which resulted from keeping up the price of public lands should go into the treasury, for that would lessen the need of a high tariff after the payment of the national debt. To satisfy both these conditions they urged the distribution of the proceeds of the public lands among the several States according to population. . . .

On the other hand, the West felt that its present existence and its future development depended absolutely upon such changes in the administration of the public lands as would make all its inhabitants freeholders and attract new settlers to occupy its millions of acres of fresh lands. Benton was expressing the antagonism of the free land West toward the revenue attitude of the East when he said in 1826: "I speak to statesmen and not to compting clerks; to Senators, and not to *quaestors* of provinces; to an assembly of legislators, and not to a keeper of the King's forests. I speak to Senators who know this to be a Republic, not a Monarchy; who know that the public lands belong to the People, and not to the Federal Government." This appeal by Benton to the Senate was made in behalf of his graduation bill which embodied in general the growing demands of the West. It included a reduction in the price of lands each year until within four years the price per acre became twenty-five cents; a donation to actual settlers of lands which were not sold after being offered at fifty cents an acre; and a cession of all lands, which were not bought after being offered for one year at twenty-five cents an acre, to the States in which they lay.

. . . the South Atlantic States occupied a neutral position in regard to the Western plans for the disposition of the public domain. Her main interest at this time was the tariff. She wanted

no deficit which would result in a higher tariff and no surplus to be used for internal improvements. The struggles of sections were centering about these three economic issues—tariff, public lands, and internal improvements. The interest of the different sections in these issues, in the order of their importance, was as follows: The Northwest—low-priced public lands, internal improvements, a high tariff; the Southwest—low-priced public lands, a low tariff, internal improvements; the seaboard South—a low tariff, no internal improvements at federal expense, high-priced public lands; the North Atlantic States—a high tariff, high-priced public lands, internal improvements. Under these conditions the North Atlantic States, the South, and the West, needed the assistance of another section to get what each wanted most,—a high tariff, a low tariff, and freedom of the public domain respectively. The most likely combination was for each allying section to give up a secondary interest in order to obtain its primary interest. The manufacturing North Atlantic States, after 1828, were disposed to grant internal improvements in order to get the aid of the Northwest for the passage of a protective tariff against the embittered South; but the Northwest and the North Atlantic States were at odds on the public lands, the chief interest of the former. In general, with certain restrictions, the logical alliance was that of the South and West, each giving up a lesser interest and obtaining its chief interest: the South Atlantic States would help the West to obtain what it wanted on the public lands, while the Northwest would assist the South in its effort to pass a lower tariff. . . .

[*The Coalition of South and West.*] Nothing was more natural than that the South and West should draw together to make a political alliance at this time, against their common enemy, the Northeast. . . .

The opportunity for strengthening the ties between the South and the West was soon provided by the aggression of the manufacturing North Atlantic States in Congress. December 17, 1829, Hunt, of Vermont, moved that the Committee on Public Lands be instructed to inquire into the expediency of distributing the net annual proceeds of the public land sales among the States for education and internal improvements according to their proportionate representation in the House of Representatives. Hunt, to be sure, declared that his object was to establish a general system for the equal distribution of the returns from the public lands among all sections, to replace the present course of partial and unequal grants to particular States and institutions. In addition, the distribution plan was introduced to block the claim of the Western States to the land within their limits, because it admitted as a prem-

ise that the United States owned the public domain. It was regarded by the South and West as a renewed attempt on the part of the North Atlantic States to settle the land question in accordance with their economic interests, and they immediately opposed it to protect themselves. Representatives of both sections declared that the proposal was premature, for the proceeds of the public lands would not be available for distribution until the national debt had been paid. The South believed that it was designed to perpetuate the tariff. . . .

[*The Re-alignment of Sections, 1832-1862.*]

Thus the West and the South acted together from 1830 to 1832, upon the common basis of opposition to the Eastern plan for the distribution of the proceeds of the public lands, which would result in the high price of land and the maintenance of a protective tariff, both antagonistic to the economic development of the two sections. But the West, failing to obtain any positive assistance from its alliance with the South, turned to the Administration party, and was saved from Clay's public land distribution bill by Jackson's pocket veto in March, 1833. . . . In 1840, the West, as the section which was growing most rapidly in population and political strength, held the balance of power, and was appealed to by Calhoun and the South, and the two national party leaders, Van Buren and Clay. The interests of the settler West were jeopardized by Clay's interpretation of the Whig victory to mean a national indorsement of the distribution of the proceeds of public lands; but the hostility of the low-tariff South to this measure . . . served the West by preventing the passage of a distribution bill. . . .

Public lands persisted after 1842 as both a party and sectional question. The manufacturers and the financial interests still urged distribution, while the pioneer West demanded reduction and cession and joined with the labor element in advocating donation. . . . From 1828 to 1842 the South had regarded the public lands in reference to a low tariff, but soon after 1842 her attitude on the land question was determined by her desire for the extension of slavery. The close connection of these two subjects became more evident in 1848, when the Free Soil party included in their platform free grants to actual settlers. Thus it was impossible for the free pioneer West, though aided by the growing labor movement and the anti-slavery forces, to obtain the passage of the Homestead Act before the outbreak of the Civil War.

6. *Congressional Votes as Tests of Sectional Division.* The four preceding sections have indicated that political divisions followed sec-

tional lines on certain major public questions. But they have also indicated that dissenting economic interests within the section often failed to conform to the sectional tendency and that the section's position on a given question might be reversed as its economy altered. In such a complex situation the only real proof of sectional division is not whether theoretical reasons for it can be shown but whether division itself can be shown. The following tabulation of certain votes in Congress will enable the student to apply this test for himself. In all of these tables, a blank indicates that the state was not at that time a member of the Union and represented in Congress. Where the vote is indicated, 0-0, members were not voting or seats were vacant.

[*The Tariff of 1828*]

In 1828 Congress adopted a very high tariff, far in advance of the previous acts of 1816 and 1824. The measure was deeply involved in party politics, and its opponents used very subtle and devious tactics in the attempt to defeat it. They anticipated that on a straightforward question of higher duties, the protectionists would command a majority. Hence they concluded that they must create dissension among the tariff advocates and that this could be accomplished by including duties on raw materials such as wool which were needed by industry, especially in New England. Thus the industrialist who would normally support the tariff for the sake of its effect on the price of his products might now vote against it because of its effect on the price of his materials. This condition, together with the traditional devotion of ports such as Boston to international trade, was expected to swing New England into the antitariff column.

Such tactics, although clever, were very dangerous, for they led low-tariff men to gamble on making the bill so frankly protectionist that even friends of protection would reject it. If the gamble failed, however, advocates of free trade would find that they had brought on themselves a more extreme and offensive measure than their most partisan opponents had designed to impose upon them.

In terms of sectionalism, the significance is that one section attempts to break the political solidarity of another section. As the table shows, this stratagem did detach some votes from areas that were normally protectionist, but the bill passed nevertheless. The vote by states in the House of Representatives, April 22, 1828, was as follows: ¹⁴

	For	Against		For	Against
Alabama	0	3	Vermont	3	0
Connecticut	4	2	Virginia	6	11
Delaware	1	0		107	86
Georgia	0	7			
Illinois	1	0			
Indiana	3	0			
Kentucky	12	0			
Louisiana	0	3			
Maine	0	7			
Maryland	1	5			
Massachusetts	2	11			
Mississippi	0	1			
Missouri	0	1			
New Hampshire	4	2			
New Jersey	5	0			
New York	27	6			
North Carolina	0	13			
Ohio	13	0			
Pennsylvania	23	0			
Rhode Island	1	1			
South Carolina	0	8			
Tennessee	0	9			
Vermont	5	0			
Virginia	3	15			
	105	94			

[Internal Improvements]

On the question of internal improvements, as Hockett's discussion has stated, the position of the sections did not remain static. Instead, sectional alliances changed very markedly. To test this interpretation, two votes on internal improvement questions are shown. The first is the vote in the House of Representatives, February 8, 1817, by which the Bonus Bill was adopted; the second is the vote of the same body, April 29, 1830, to appropriate funds for the Maysville Turnpike in Kentucky. The measure was regarded as a test on the general policy of internal improvements.¹⁶

	Bonus Bill		Maysville Bill	
	For	Against	For	Against
Alabama	2	1
Connecticut	0	6	4	0
Delaware	0	2	1	0

[The Bank of the United States]

On July 3, 1832, the House of Representatives adopted Henry Clay's bill renewing the charter of the second Bank of the United States. President Jackson promptly vetoed the measure and it never became law. The vote by states was as follows: ¹⁵

	For	Against
Alabama	0	3
Connecticut	6	0
Delaware	1	0
Georgia	0	7
Illinois	0	0
Indiana	1	2
Kentucky	6	5
Louisiana	3	0
Maine	1	6
Maryland	5	3
Massachusetts	12	0
Mississippi	0	1
Missouri	1	0
New Hampshire	0	5
New Jersey	6	0
New York	12	18
North Carolina	4	8
Ohio	10	3
Pennsylvania	24	1
Rhode Island	2	0
South Carolina	2	6
Tennessee	2	7

[Public Lands]

Like the internal improvement issue, the public-land question is said to have revealed a shifting of sectional alignments and coalitions. As a check on this, one may analyze two votes by the House of Representatives. The first was the adoption of a resolution on January 18, 1830, in favor of distributing the proceeds of public-land sales among the

states in shares proportionate to their representation in the House. The second was the adoption on July 6, 1841, of the so-called General Preemption Law which allowed squatters (settlers without title) a prior right to acquire the land on which they had settled, by purchase at a fixed minimum price rather than at public auction.¹⁷

		Distribution Bill		Preemption Act	
		For Against		For Against	
		5	0	4	4
		6	2	6	2
		9	1	11	1
		0	0
		0	1	0	0
		0	1	0	2
		6	0	0	5
		6	0	6	0
		21	9	18	20
		8	4	5	8
		6	7	12	7
		22	1	13	12
		2	0	2	0
		0	8	0	9
		1	7	5	7
		4	0	5	0
		2	10	6	14
		113	70	117	108
Alabama	0 3	0	5		
Arkansas	0	0		
Connecticut	5 0	6	0		
Delaware	1 0	1	0		
Georgia	0 7	0	8		
Illinois	0 1	0	0		
Indiana	0 3	6	1		
Kentucky	9 2	9	2		
Louisiana	0 3	2	1		

VI

Slavery—The Sectional Touchstone

DOUTBLES the most widely advertised ship in American history is the *Mayflower*; but a year before she sailed another ship had made a voyage which had a far greater influence upon the development of American history than did that of the *Mayflower*. This was a mystery ship. Whence she came, what name she bore, what master sailed her, whither she was bound, no man can say. Out of the mists of time and the sea she appeared off Jamestown, in Virginia, in the year 1619; and after touching there, over the rim of the world she disappeared, never to be identified again. All that is known of her is that she flew the Dutch flag, and that she landed twenty Negroes at Jamestown—the first Negroes ever to set foot in English-speaking America.

GERALD W. JOHNSON

The Secession of the Southern States

CONTENTS

Questions for Study	152
Historical Background	153
Part I: The Condition of Slavery	155
Part II: Aspects of Slavery	165

QUESTIONS FOR STUDY

1. On the basis of the materials in Part I, compare the legal and the actual right of the slave to contract a marriage and to own property.
2. Compare Miss Kemble's account of conditions of plantation slavery with that of Mrs. Smedes, showing specific points at which their descriptions present dissimilarities.
3. On the basis of the materials in Part I, what practices existed with reference to (1) the enforcement of slave discipline, (2) the care of the sick, and (3) the standard of living, including diet, clothing, and housing.
4. In an appraisal of the reliability of the various narrators or writers in Sections A and B of Part I, what positive qualifications does each have, and what factors might be urged against the reliability of each? Which would you regard as the most accurate and characteristic account, and which the least so? If each account were perfectly accurate, what difficulty would still remain in forming an estimate of the plantation system?
5. Certain writers have assumed that if the productive efficiency of a slave worker was lower than that of a free worker, the labor of the slave could not, in the long run, compete with that of the free worker. What is the fallacy of this argument?
6. Why were "free" Negroes subjected to many legal restraints on their actual freedom?
7. Compare the proslavery arguments of the slavery period (Part II, Section D) with the appraisals of slavery by modern historians (Section E). Do you find that any of the earlier arguments are still employed, either in direct or in modified form?
8. Calhoun's argument held that the great majority of people must engage in manual labor and that it was better to give them a fixed status as workers than to promise them more than society would be able to fulfill. Was this argument any more valid when first offered than it would be today?
9. Is there any validity in the idea that slavery was a necessary and useful transitional stage in which the Negro race received essential preparation for freedom and self-reliant status in a society unlike that of Africa?
10. Why did the South defend slavery more earnestly after 1850 than during the Revolutionary and post-Revolutionary period?
11. American Negro slavery is often regarded primarily as an economic system—a form of labor. If Albert G. Brown's attitude was representative, how ought it to be regarded?
12. Using Milton's concept of two types of slavery, classify the examples in Part I and indicate which example represents manorial slavery in its purest form and which, commercial slavery?

In 1850 sixteen out of every hundred persons in the United States were Negroes, and fourteen of these sixteen were slaves. All these slaves were either wholly or partially of Negro descent. The total number of slaves was 3,204,000; the total of free Negroes was 434,000. In the states north of Maryland, Delaware, Kentucky, and Missouri, there were no slaves; but in the states of the upper South there were forty-eight slaves to every one hundred free persons, and in the lower South, seventy-three slaves to every one hundred free.

These facts carry two important implications. First, the slavery question in the United States was linked with a question of race. In other societies where slavery had existed no comparable linkage occurred; such societies may have had distinctions of both race and status, but the two did not fuse and reinforce each other as in the United States, where the racial quality of the Negro automatically suggested a status of slavery and where the status of slavery was associated exclusively with the Negro group in the population.

Second, the slavery question was a sectional question, indeed the most completely sectionalized question in American public life. In the states north of the Mason-Dixon Line and the Ohio River the non-existence of slavery was regarded as such a distinctive feature that the term "free states" was generally applied. In the states south of this line—"slave states," so-called—slavery was recognized as the "peculiar institution." Financially, the slaves of the South were valued at \$1,600,000,000 in 1850, which was more than half of the total worth of all real and personal property in the region. Economically, slave labor cultivated the bulk of the staple crops which formed the backbone of the southern system and provided the principal export product of the United States. Socially, slavery served as the foundation upon which the elegant superstructure of plantation life was erected. This is a factor which was universally recognized. But slavery also served as a distinctive means of social control for the Negroes, who as the progeny of African stock had not shared in the western European culture common to almost all other people transplanted to America.

These circumstances meant that slavery became a sectional divisor in a far more fundamental sense than the questions of tariff, bank, internal improvements, or public lands. Its economic and social features alone made for sectionalism, even at a time when the moral issue concerning the ethics of slavery was still quiescent. Thus, at the Constitutional Convention, when slavery existed legally in a majority of the northern states, thoughtful men already recognized the profound difference between "planting" states and "carrying" states (above, p. 88). Purely as an opportunistic question of power, having no reference to moral values, slavery had precipitated a struggle in the Convention between northern and southern delegations who contested whether slaves should be counted as persons for purposes of representation. They had compromised by agreeing to base representation upon "the whole number of free persons . . . excluding Indians . . . and three-fifths of all other persons." But it galled northern spokesmen that this gave to the citizens of a state with a large slave population a greater representation than was accorded to an equal number of citizens in a state with a small slave population.

In terms of sectional advantage alone, therefore, slavery invited dissension. But in a far more basic sense it became the focus of nationalistic and sectional antithesis, because it implicitly challenged certain beliefs in the American nationalistic ideal. Problem I has shown a few of the evidences that early expressions of nationalism were deeply infused with belief in the equality and the dignity of man. Thomas Paine had justified revolt against George III on the ground that his

government exploited American humanity. Thomas Jefferson had asserted that "all men are created equal" and that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Crèvecoeur had observed that a spirit of devotion to America grew quickly in the immigrant, because the adopted country offered an equality and opportunity the fatherland did not provide. Kohn's discussion has emphasized the importance of popular government in the growth of nationalism.

The institution of slavery withheld all these values from a specific group in the population. To deny such values anywhere is to deny their universality; to deny their universality is to suggest undefined limitations which jeopardize the entire concept. This is not to say that the people of the slaveholding states had deliberately discarded the ideals of self-government, freedom, equality, and democracy. In fact they remained deeply attached to the application of these ideals in some areas, but at the same time they had paradoxically come to accept the violation of the ideal in certain other areas. Indeed the status of the Negro in democratic America, both North and South, still presents the same paradox. Only recently Gunnar Myrdal has emphasized the point by giving the title, *An American Dilemma*, to his important study of the Negro in the United States today.

Where an institution as important and as deeply fortified as slavery bore upon the values of nationalism and emphasized the dualism of the sections, it inevitably became the subject of intense dispute. Controversy once raged over the question whether it was ethically justifiable. Controversy still continues as to what it was like in practice, what effectiveness it had as an economic institution, and how the problem which it presented ought to have been solved. Many of the points in dispute are matters of judgment on which no complete agreement is likely ever to be reached. The materials in this Problem, therefore, cannot provide any categorical answers, but they will serve to illustrate some of the aspects of this strange and important institution.

Part I.

THE CONDITION OF SLAVERY

Slavery has existed since ancient times and cannot be regarded as obsolete even now, in view of the use of forced labor on the continents of Europe and Asia. For many centuries a regular traffic in slaves flowed from the interior of Africa toward the Orient. In most parts of western Europe, however, no true slavery existed from the period of the Roman Empire until the time when the Portuguese navigators, under the sponsorship of Prince Henry the Navigator, began their explorations along the coast of Africa. These sailors began to bring slaves to Europe on a small but systematic scale before the end of the fifteenth century. African slavery did not, however, become an institution of world significance until the Spanish began to transport slaves to America for use on the sugar plantations of the West Indies. A traffic of vast dimensions resulted. For three centuries—sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth—the African slave trade was one of the most valuable elements of international commerce. The control of it was enough to enrich a nation; Portugal, Spain, Holland, and Great Britain competed for it, and each in turn dominated it. By 1800 sentiment had turned against it; the economic need for it had dwindled; and it virtually disappeared during the first decade of the century. For three hundred years, however, it had created fortunes in Europe and America, had contributed to the shifts of international power, had caused the sale of perhaps as many as 5,000,000 human beings into slavery, and had constituted nothing less than “the rape of a continent.”

The British colonies which later became the United States were not important in the history of the slave trade, but the slave trade was important in their history. The New England shipowners handled only a small fraction of the traffic, and the South Atlantic colonies received only a minor fraction of the slaves that were brought to America. The West Indies and the Spanish Main received far more. But as early as 1619 (a year before the Plymouth settlement) a cargo of Negroes was sold in Virginia. In the eighteenth century slave labor became general on the tobacco plantations of Virginia and the rice and indigo plantations of Carolina. When the United States took its first census in 1790, more than a third of the inhabitants of the southern states (including and south of Maryland) were slaves.

What does it mean to say that these persons were slaves? They were, to be sure, men and women who were not free, but mere lack of freedom does not define slavery, because every person serving a jail sentence is unfree, and so were all the serfs of Europe who owed labor to their lords and who could not leave the manor. But the prisoner is unfree only because of his conviction for an offense, and the land could not be taken from the serf any more readily than the serf could be taken from the land. A slave, by contrast, is one who has the lifelong status of a chattel, which status is inherited or transmitted through the female line and which is modified by certain legal protections varying from colony to colony or from state to state. A chattel is, by legal definition, “any item of movable or immovable property except real estate.” To say, then, that a slave in the United States was a chattel is to say that he could be treated as an item of property—that is, bought, sold, mortgaged, bequeathed, moved from place to place, employed, and otherwise used as his owner might choose to use him. The child of a slave mother inherited this status whether the father was slave or free. Thus, a slave master’s own child might be born into slavery; this happened infrequently but was by no means unheard of. Theoretically, the child of a free mother by a slave father would have been free, though there are almost no records of such cases. As a chattel the slave had no civil rights: he could not legally own property or enter into any contract, not even the contract of marriage; nor could he bring any kind of case or even testify against a white person in court. In a number of states any white person might legally punish him if he left his master’s premises without a written pass.

Such is a chattel in the eyes of law. But by nature the slave, as a human, possessed qualities which other movable or immovable objects, animate or inanimate, did not have. The church taught that he possessed an immortal soul; society recognized that, like other men, he was responsible for his deeds and entitled to be treated as a human. Consequently

his chattel status was modified somewhat by law and somewhat more by practice. The law would try and punish him, as it did no other chattels, for criminal acts such as murder, assault, or theft; it would require his master to give him a certain minimum of sustenance, to work him no more than a maximum number of hours; it would penalize masters who seriously mistreated or did violence to their slaves. Under these laws whites were, on occasion, tried and punished. In practice masters were even more disposed to qualify the chattel status. Many slaves, perhaps the majority, were permitted to possess their own personal effects, to sell minor produce as a source of petty cash for their own use, to maintain their own small gardens around their cabins, and to become husband and wife by a ceremony corresponding to legal marriage. The actual condition of the slaves of course varied infinitely within these legal and human limits, and the significance of the status was not that it condemned the slave to bad living conditions but that it left him powerless to control his own welfare.

Where the widest possible range of conditions actually existed and controversy imparted rancor to the subject, opposing groups began to depict extreme aspects of slavery as though they were characteristic. Proslavery men insisted upon the reciprocal devotion of master and slaves, the harmony of white and black folk on the plantation, and the patriarchal character of a system in which the slaves, with no fear of unemployment, bankruptcy, or bread lines, lived in idyllic happiness while the master shouldered the burdens of responsibility. Critics of the system, on the other hand, contended that slavery was invariably vicious and brutalizing, imposing wretchedness and abuse on the slaves and evoking every sadistic and domineering strain in the personality of the masters.

Both points of view were attempts to generalize about some three million individual cases, and any such generalization is certain to have exceptions—that is, to be false in many individual cases. The viewpoint of the Abolitionist group will be treated more fully in Problem VII, but a number of descriptions of slavery may well be considered at this point. These will represent the impressions of both those who viewed it adversely and those who viewed it favorably, those who observed it as free people and those who experienced it as slaves.

In reading these descriptions, one must remember that from such limited sources no valid conclusion can be drawn as to the average conditions of several million slaves. The evidence will, however, serve to show the diversity of the views which people held and the wide range of conditions existing under slavery.

A.

OBSERVATIONS OF FREE PEOPLE ON SLAVERY

The four selections which follow offer diverse views of slavery, but, in addition, they also attempt to use more than one kind of observation. The usual kind is a conscious record made by someone who has formed an impression on a subject and who tries to set it down in a form which will convey it effectively to someone else. Intentionally or not, such a record may be colored by a desire to persuade and may be selective in what it includes. Two descriptions by observers—women in both cases—who had seen slavery in operation are of this category of conscious records. But often a record made for one purpose may be used for another. For instance, a man's record in an account book of the purchase of theater tickets, although made as a budgetary memorandum, can be used to illustrate his taste in drama. As such it may show his qualities more accurately than a statement in which he attempts to defend his own taste. This constitutes in a sense an unconscious record, and two such unconscious records are included here—both by men and both in the form of instructions by slaveowners to overseers who operated their plantations. Here no one intended to illuminate the history of slavery but only to cause the overseers to manage the slaves properly. But what they regarded as proper management illuminates the history of slavery.

1. *Slavery: Georgia Rice Fields*. In the 1830s a talented and famous English actress, Frances Anne Kemble, made a tour of America. Dur-

ing her visit she met and later married an American, Pierce Butler, who owned rice plantations on the Georgia coast. He had

been for some years an absentee owner, but in 1838 he and his bride went to live on one of the plantations. Mrs. Butler described her experiences in a series of letters to her friend Elizabeth Dwight Sedgwick.¹

[*The slave quarters*] These cabins consist of one room, about twelve feet by fifteen, with a couple of closets smaller and closer than the state-rooms of a ship, divided off from the main room and each other by rough wooden partitions, in which the inhabitants sleep. They have almost all of them a rude bedstead, with the gray moss of the forests for mattress, and filthy, pestilential-looking blankets for covering. Two families (sometimes eight and ten in number) reside in one of these huts, which are mere wooden frames pinned, as it were, to the earth by a brick chimney outside, whose enormous aperture within pours down a flood of air, but little counteracted by the miserable spark of fire, which hardly sends an attenuated thread of lingering smoke up its huge throat. A wide ditch runs immediately at the back of these dwellings, which is filled and emptied daily by the tide. Attached to each hovel is a small scrap of ground for a garden, which, however, is for the most part untended and uncultivated. Such of these dwellings as I visited to-day were filthy and wretched in the extreme, and exhibited that most deplorable consequence of ignorance and an abject condition, the inability of the inhabitants to secure and improve even such pitiful comfort as might yet be achieved by them. Instead of the order, neatness, and ingenuity which might convert even these miserable hovels into tolerable residences, there was the careless, reckless, filthy indolence which even the brutes do not exhibit in their lairs and nests, and which seemed incapable of applying to the uses of existence the few miserable means of comfort yet within their reach. Firewood and shavings lay littered about the floors, while the half-naked children were cowering around two or three smouldering cinders. The moss with which the chinks and crannies of their ill-protected dwellings might have been stuffed was trailing in dirt and dust about the ground, while the back door of the huts, opening upon a most unsightly ditch, was left wide open for the fowls and ducks, which they are allowed to raise, to travel in and out, increasing the filth of the cabin by what they brought and left in every direction. In the midst of the floor, or squatting round the cold hearth, would be four or five little children from four to ten years old, the latter all with babies in their arms, the care of the infants being taken from the mothers (who are driven afield as soon as they recover from child labor), and devolved upon these poor little nurses, as they are called, whose business it is to watch the infant, and carry it to

its mother whenever it may require nourishment. To these hardly human little beings I addressed my remonstrances about the filth, cold, and unnecessary wretchedness of their room, bidding the elder boys and girls kindle up the fire, sweep the floor, and expel the poultry. For a long time my very words seemed unintelligible to them, till, when I began to sweep and make up the fire, etc., they first fell to laughing, and then imitating me.

[*The enforcement of authority*] At the upper end of the row of houses, and nearest to our overseer's residence, is the hut of the head driver. Let me explain, by the way, his office. The negroes, as I before told you, are divided into troops or gangs, as they are called; at the head of each gang is a driver, who stands over them, whip in hand, while they perform their daily task, who renders an account of each individual slave and his work every evening to the overseer, and receives from him directions for their next day's tasks. Each driver is allowed to inflict a dozen lashes upon any refractory slave in the field, and at the time of the offense; they may not, however, extend the chastisement, and if it is found ineffectual, their remedy lies in reporting the unmanageable individual either to the head driver or the overseer, the former of whom has power to inflict three dozen lashes at his own discretion, and the latter as many as he himself sees fit, within the number of fifty; which limit, however, I must tell you, is an arbitrary one on this plantation, appointed by the founder of the estate, Major —, Mr. —'s grandfather, many of whose regulations, indeed I believe most of them, are still observed in the government of the plantation. Limits of this sort, however, to the power of either driver, head driver, or overseer, may or may not exist elsewhere; they are, to a certain degree, a check upon the power of these individuals; but in the absence of the master, the overseer may confine himself within the limit or not, as he chooses; and as for the master himself, where is his limit? He may, if he likes, flog a slave to death, for the laws which pretend that he may not are a mere pretense, inasmuch as the testimony of a black is never taken against a white; and upon this plantation of ours, and a thousand more, the overseer is the *only* white man, so whence should come the testimony to any crime of his? With regard to the oft-repeated statement that it is not the owner's interest to destroy his human property, it answers nothing; the instances in which men, to gratify the immediate impulse of passion, sacrifice not only their eternal, but their evident, palpable, positive worldly interest, are infinite. Nothing is commoner than for a man under the transient influence of anger to disregard his worldly advantage; and the black slave, whose preservation is

indeed supposed to be his owner's interest, may be, will be, and is occasionally sacrificed to the blind impulse of passion.

[*The mood of the slaves on a holiday, and the care of a slave who is ill*] In the afternoon I and Jack rowed ourselves over to Darien. It is Saturday—the day of the week on which the slaves from the island are permitted to come over to the town to purchase such things as they may require and can afford, and to dispose, to the best advantage, of their poultry, moss, and eggs. I met many of them paddling themselves singly in their slight canoes, scooped out of the trunk of a tree, and parties of three and four rowing boats of their own building, laden with their purchases, singing, laughing, talking, and apparently enjoying their holiday to the utmost. They all hailed me with shouts of delight as I pulled past them, and many were the injunctions bawled after Jack to “mind and take good care of missis!” We returned home through the glory of a sunset all amber-colored and rosy, and found that one of the slaves, a young lad for whom Mr. — has a particular regard, was dangerously ill. Dr. H— was sent for; and there is every probability that he, Mr. —, and Mr. O— will be up all night with the poor fellow.

[*Birthrate and parental relationship among the slaves*] . . . there are certain indirect premiums held out to obey the early commandment of replenishing the earth which do not fail to have their full effect. In the first place, none of the cares—those noble cares, that holy thoughtfulness which lifts the human above the brute parent, are ever incurred here by either father or mother. The relation indeed resembles, as far as circumstances can possibly make it do so, the short-lived connection between the animal and its young. The father, having neither authority, power, responsibility, or charge in his children, is of course, as among brutes, the least attached to his offspring; the mother, by the natural law which renders the infant dependent on her for its first year's nourishment, is more so; but as neither of them is bound to educate or to support their children, all the unspeakable tenderness and solemnity, all the rational, and all the spiritual grace and glory of the connection, is lost, and it becomes mere breeding, bearing, suckling, and there an end. But it is not only the absence of the conditions which God had affixed to the relation which tends to encourage the reckless increase of the race; they enjoy, by means of numerous children, certain positive advantages. In the first place, every woman who is pregnant, as soon as she chooses to make the fact known to the overseer, is relieved of a certain portion of her

work in the field, which lightening of labor continues, of course, as long as she is so burdened. On the birth of a child certain additions of clothing and an additional weekly ration are bestowed on the family; and these matters, small as they may seem, act as powerful inducements to creatures who have none of the restraining influences actuating them which belong to the parental relation among all other people, whether civilized or savage. Moreover, they have all of them a most distinct and perfect knowledge of their value to their owners as property; and a woman thinks, and not much amiss, that the more frequently she adds to the number of her master's livestock by bringing new slaves into the world, the more claims she will have upon his consideration and good-will. This was perfectly evident to me from the meritorious air with which the women always made haste to inform me of the number of children they had borne, and the frequent occasions on which the older slaves would direct my attention to their children, exclaiming, “Look, missis! little niggers for you and massa; plenty little niggers for you and little missis!”

[*Interview with a slave woman*] Another of my visitors had a still more dismal story to tell; her name was Die; she had had sixteen children, fourteen of whom were dead; she had had four miscarriages: one had been caused with falling down with a very heavy burden on her head, and one from having her arms strained, up to be lashed. I asked her what she meant by having her arms tied up. She said their hands were first tied together, sometimes by the wrists, and sometimes, which was worse, by the thumbs, and they were then drawn up to a tree or post, so as almost to swing them off the ground, and then their clothes rolled round their waist, and a man with a cowhide stands and stripes them. I give you the woman's words. She did not speak of this as of any thing strange, unusual, or especially horrid and abominable; and when I said, “Did they do that to you when you were with child?” she simply replied, “Yes, missis.”

2. *Slavery: Mississippi Cotton.* Thomas Smith Gregory Dabney, a native of Virginia, belonged very definitely to the gentry class and the propertied class in the Old Dominion. In 1835 he moved to Mississippi, where he established himself as a large cotton producer on a plantation called “Burleigh” in Hinds County in the interior of the state. His daughter, Susan Dabney Smedes, later described the management of Burleigh in a book about her father.²

Thomas went through a large part of Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi looking at the country

before deciding on a body of land in Hinds County, Mississippi. He succeeded in purchasing four thousand acres from half a dozen small farmers.

The ancestors of both Thomas and Sophia Dabney had been slave-owners. The family servants, inherited for generations, had come to be regarded with great affection, and this feeling was warmly returned by the negroes. The bond between master and servant was, in many cases, felt to be as sacred and close as the tie of blood.

During the course of years many of the Elmington negroes had intermarried with the negroes on neighboring estates.

When the southern move was decided on, Thomas called his servants together and announced to them his intention to remove, with his family, to Mississippi. He further went on to say that he did not mean to take one unwilling servant with him. His plan was to offer to buy all husbands and wives, who were connected with his negroes, at the owners' prices, or he should, if his people preferred, sell those whom he owned to any master or mistress whom they might choose. No money difficulty should stand in the way. Everything should be made to yield to the important consideration of keeping families together.

Without an exception, the negroes determined to follow their beloved master and mistress. They chose rather to give up the kinspeople and friends of their own race than to leave them.

Mammy Harriet says of this time, "Marster was good all de time. He do all he could to comfort he people. When he was gittin' ready to move to Mississippi, he call 'em all up, an' tell 'em dat he did not want anybody to foller him who was not willin'. He say, all could stay in Figinny, an' dey could choose dey own marsters to stay wid. Ebery one o' he own, and all who b'long to de odder members o' de fambly who was wid him, say dey want to foller him, 'ceptin' 'twas two ole people, ole gray-headed people, who was too ole to trable. An' dey was de onliest ones leff behind on dat plantation, an' dey did cry so much I did feel so sorry for dem. I couldn't help cryin', I feel so sorry. Our people say, 'Ef you got a husband or a wife who won't go to Mississippi, leff dat one behind. Ef you got a good marster, foller him.' " . . .

His plantation was considered a model one, and was visited by planters anxious to learn his methods. He was asked how he made his negroes do good work. His answer was that a laboring man could do more work and better work in five and a half days than in six. He used to give the half of Saturdays to his negroes, unless there was a great press of work; but a system of rewards was more efficacious than any other method. He distributed prizes of money among his cotton-pickers every week during the season, which lasted four or five

months. One dollar was the first prize, a Mexican coin valued at eighty-seven and a half cents the second, seventy-five cents the third, and so on, down to the smallest prize, a small Mexican coin called picayune, which was valued at six and a quarter cents. The decimal nomenclature was not in use there. The coins were spoken of as "bits." Eighty-seven and a half cents were seven bits, fifty cents four bits, twenty-five cents two bits. The master gave money to all who worked well for the prizes, whether they won them or not. When one person picked six hundred pounds in a day, a five-dollar gold-piece was the reward. On most other plantations four hundred pounds or three hundred and fifty or three hundred was considered a good day's work, but on the Burleigh place many picked five hundred pounds. All had to be picked free of trash. No one could do this who had not been trained in childhood. To get five hundred pounds a picker had to use both hands at once. Those who went into the cotton-fields after they were grown only knew how to pull out cotton by holding on to the stalk with one hand and picking it out with the other. Two hundred pounds a day would be a liberal estimate of what the most industrious could do in this manner. A very tall and lithe young woman, one of mammy's "brer Billy's" children, was the best cotton-picker at Burleigh. She picked two rows at a time, going down the middle with both arms extended and grasping the cotton-bolls with each hand. Some of the younger generation learned to imitate this. At Christmas Nelly's share of the prize-money was something over seventeen dollars. Her pride in going up to the master's desk to receive it, in the presence of the assembled negroes, as the acknowledged leader of the cotton-pickers, was a matter of as great interest to the white family as to her own race.

The negroes were helped in every way to gather the cotton, not being interrupted or broken down by any other work. Some of the men were detailed to carry the cotton-hampers to the wagons that the pickers might lift no weights. Water-carriers, with buckets of fresh water, went up and down the rows handing water to the pickers. They would get so interested and excited over the work that they had to be made to leave the fields at night, some of the very ambitious ones wishing to sleep at the end of their rows, that they might be up and at work in the morning earlier than their rivals. The cotton was weighed three times a day, and the number of pounds picked by each servant set down opposite to his or her name on a slate. . . . In addition to the cotton crop, corn was raised in such abundance that it was not an unusual thing to sell a surplus of a thousand or two bushels or more. A maxim with the master was that no animal grew fat on bought corn. In putting in his corn crop he made full allowance for a

bad season, hence there was never a scarcity. A lock on a corn-crib was not known. After the mules and horses were fed in the evening the negroes carried home all that they cared to have. They raised chickens by the hundred. One of the chicken-raisers, old Uncle Isaac, estimated that he raised five hundred, unless the season was bad. Uncle Isaac's boast was that he was a child of the same year as the master, and that the master's mother had given to him in her own arms some of the baby Thomas's milk, as there was more of it than he wanted. He would draw himself up as he added, "I called marster brother till I was a right big boy, an' I called his mother ma till I was old enough to know better an' to stop it myself. She never tole me to stop."

The negroes sold all the chickens they did not eat. They were taken to Raymond or Cooper's Well in a four-mule wagon, provided by the master. As he paid the market price, and as there was some risk of their getting less than he gave, there was not often a desire to send them off if he would take them. . . .

The thrifty negroes made so much on their chickens, peanuts, popcorn, molasses-cakes, baskets, mats, brooms, taking in sewing, and in other little ways, that they were able to buy luxuries. Some of the women bought silk dresses; many had their Sunday dresses made by white mantua-makers. Of course they had the clothes of the master and mistress in addition; and in later years, as the house grew full of young masters and young mistresses, theirs were added. As the family knew that the servants liked nothing so well as the well-made clothes that they laid aside, they wore their clothes but little. They justly considered that those who had labored for them had rights to them while still fresh. Under these circumstances it did not seem wasteful for a daughter of the house to distribute, at the end of a season, as many as a dozen or more dresses that had been made up but a few months before. It was quite funny to see among the gallants three or four swallow-tail coats of the master's come in at the gate for the grand promenade on Sunday evenings, escorting the colored belles in all their bravery of hoop-skirts, and ruffles, and ribbons, and flowers. Mammy Harriet gives me this account of the management at Burleigh:

"De men had twelve pounds o' meat ebey two weeks an' de women ten pounds. Viney, my brer Billy's daughter, had as much as a man. You see she was a hearty eater. An' dey had 'lasses too 'cordin' to dey famblys,—a water-bucketful. Den some on 'em let dey meat gin out o' de house, an' den he go out to de smoke-house an' cut mo'. I hab see marster out in de fiel' after breakfast an' Headman Charles say to him, 'Marster, some

o' dese people ain't got nothin' to eat.' Den he ride back an' hab a bushel o' meal sifted, an' git a piece o' meat, an' tie up de salt, an' ride back an' say, 'Charles, let those fellows get a plenty of oak bark and cook these things. Here is a plenty of meat and meal and salt.' Den dey sot on sometimes a dozen pots an' bile water to make up all dat bread.

"Dyar warn't no chile born on dat place widout no clo'es to put on. Missis had 'em made in de house. I know I myself mik' clo'es for Nelly chile, eben to de bonnet. I mik' de bonnet out o' a piece o' missis dress. She gib five pieces to ebey chile at a time. She had two made in de house, de udder three she say, 'Make yourself. You ought to know how to sew for yourself.'

"Ebey udder Sunday was draw day. Dey draw de meat an' missis lay aside all her clo'es an' her chillun clo'es to gib 'way,—a pile on 'em. She say, 'Maria, send the servants to me in the house,' an' she gib de clo'es to 'em. I heard her say to marster one day, 'There is a beggar-woman here.' 'Well, have you something to give her?' 'No; I have too many servants to give my clothes to beggars. Give her some money.' He says, 'Very well.' An' he gib he 'oman money. She nebber 'fused her people nuthin'; nobody warn't fear'd to ask her for anything.' . . .

Every other year he distributed blankets on the plantation, giving one apiece to each individual. Many of the families were large, and as the fathers would move off under a load of twelve or fourteen blankets, some, whose quivers were less full, would be heard to exclaim over the good fortune of the lucky ones. There were usually a dozen or so left over in these distributions, and they were thrown in for good measure to those who had the large families. "Poor things, they have so many children," seemed to my dear mother a sufficient explanation for special favors that she often bestowed on those who had no other claim. Some of the negro men with the big families of children had a funny little affectation of feigning not to know either the names or the number of their boys and girls. "I disremember, missis, dyar's so many on 'em," with a little pleased laugh, was considered a sufficient answer to inquiries on the subject on every-day occasions. But not so on the days when blankets were to be given out. Then their memories were fresh. Then the babies that had not been in their cradles more than a few days, mayhap hours, were remembered and mentioned in due turn, with no danger of being forgotten or overlooked because there were "so many on 'em."

In addition to the blankets, comforts were quilted in the house by the seamstresses for every woman who had a young baby. The every-day clothes of all the negroes were cut out and made

in the house; two complete woollen suits for winter and two cotton ones for summer. For Sundays, a bright calico dress was given to each woman. The thrifty ones, and, with scarcely an exception, these negroes were thrifty, had more than they needed, and the clothes were in their chests a year before they were put on. The woollen socks and stockings for both men and women were knit in the cabins by old women, and in the "great house" by young girls. These last were set a task by the mistress, with the privilege of holiday the rest of the day when it was done. This had the desired effect of making them quick and industrious, and so interested that they would be at their work betimes in the morning. The clever ones sometimes got through with the allotted task before breakfast.

3. *Instructions to the Overseer on his Cotton Plantation by J. W. Fowler, of Coahoma County, Mississippi, in 1857.*³

The health, happiness, good discipline and obedience; good, sufficient and comfortable clothing, a sufficiency of good wholesome and nutritious food for both man and beast being indispensably necessary to successful planting, as well as for reasonable dividends for the amount of capital invested, without saying anything about the Master's duty to his dependents, to himself, and his God—I do hereby establish the following rules and regulations for the management of my Prairie Plantation, and require an observance of the same by any and all Overseers I may at any time have in charge thereof to wit:—

Punishment must never be cruel or abusive, for it is absolutely mean and unmanly to whip a negro from mere passion or malice, and any man who can do this is entirely unworthy and unfit to have control of either man or beast.

My negroes are permitted to come to me with their complaints and grievances and in no instance shall they be punished for so doing. On examination, should I find they have been cruelly treated, it shall be considered a good and sufficient cause for the immediate discharge of the Overseer.

Prove and show by your conduct toward the negroes that you feel a kind and considerate regard for them. Never cruelly punish or overwork them, never require them to do what they cannot reasonably accomplish or otherwise abuse them, but seek to render their situation as comfortable and contented as possible.

See that their necessities are supplied, that their food and clothing be good and sufficient, their houses comfortable; and be kind and attentive to them in sickness and old age.

See that the negroes are regularly fed and that

their food be wholesome, nutritious and well cooked.

See that they keep themselves well cleaned: at least once a week (especially during summer) inspect their houses and see that they have been swept clean, examine their bedding and see that they are occasionally well aired; their clothes mended and everything attended to that conduces to their health, comfort and happiness.

If any of the negroes have been reported sick, be prompt to see what ails them and that proper medicine and attention be given them. Use good judgment and discretion in turning out those who are getting well.

I greatly desire that the Gospel be preached to the Negroes when the services of a suitable person can be procured. This should be done on the Sabbath; day time is preferable, if convenient to the Minister.

Christianity, humanity and order elevate all—injure none—whilst infidelity, selfishness and disorder curse some—delude others and degrade all. I therefore want all of my people encouraged to cultivate religious feeling and morality, and punished for inhumanity to their children or stock—for profanity, lying and stealing.

All hands should be required to retire to rest and sleep at a suitable hour and permitted to remain there until such time as it will be necessary to get out in time to reach their work by the time they can see well how to work—particularly so when the nights are short and the mornings very cold and inclement.

Allow such as may desire it a suitable piece of ground to raise potatoes, tobacco. They may raise chickens also with privileges of marketing the same at suitable leisure times.

There being a sufficient number of negroes on the plantation for society among themselves, they are not to be allowed to go off the plantation merely to seek society, nor on business without a permit from myself or the Overseer in charge—nor are other negroes allowed to visit the plantation.

4. *Instructions to the Overseer on his Cotton Plantation at Thorn Island near Augusta by Alexander Telfair, of Augusta, Georgia, in 1832.*⁴

Rules and directions from my Thorn Island Plantation by which my Overseers are to govern themselves in the management of it.—ALEXANDER TELFAIR.

(The directions in this book are to be strictly attended to.)

1 The allowance for every grown Negro however old and good for nothing, and every young one that works in the field, is a peck of corn each week, and a pint of salt, and a piece of

meat, not exceeding fourteen pounds, per month.

2 No Negro to have more than Fifty lashes inflicted for any offence, no matter how great the crime.

3 The suckling children, and all other small ones who do not work in the field, draw a half allowance of corn and salt.

4 You will give tickets to any of the negroes who apply for them, to go any where about the neighborhood, but do not allow them to go off it without, nor suffer any strange negroes to come on it without a pass.

5 The negroes to be tasked when the work

allows it. I require a reasonable days work, well done—the task to be regulated by the state of the ground and the strength of the negro. . . .

16 If there is any fighting on the Plantation, whip all engaged in it—for no matter what the cause may have been, all are in the wrong. . . .

31 My negroes are not allowed to plant cotton for themselves. Every thing else they may plant, and you will give them tickets to sell what they make.

32 I have no Driver. You are to task the negroes yourself, and each negro is responsible to you for his own work, and nobodys else.

B.

OBSERVATIONS OF SLAVES ON SLAVERY

Those who were in a position to understand best the meaning of slavery were able to explain it least, for the slaves were seldom literate and enjoyed few opportunities to record their experience in articulate form. The principal statements during the period of slavery were made by escaped slaves, whose experience is hardly a good cross section. Numerous ex-slaves, however, survived for many years after emancipation, and more than two thousand were still alive in the 1930s, at which time the Federal Writers Project interviewed them and encouraged them to tell the story of their lives. This work was apparently done in an objective way; no attempt was made to prove anything, and the narrators varied widely in their attitude toward life in slavery. Some of the best accounts have been edited by B. A. Botkin and published under the title *Lay My Burden Down* (1945). The following narratives are taken from his collection. Here it may be remarked that, in general, the recollections of very old persons are less accurate than those of others, although none is exact enough for the historian to accept uncritically. But this is a generalization, and notable exceptions may be found.

1. *Narrative of Ben Simpson, age 90, Madisonville, Texas.*⁵

Boss, I's born in Georgia, in Norcross, and I's ninety years old. My father's name was Roger Stielsen, and my mother's name was Betty. Massa Earl Stielsen captures them in Africa and bring them to Georgia. He got kilt, and my sister and me went to his son. His son was a killer. He got in trouble there in Georgia and got him two good-stepping hosses and the covered wagon. Then he chains all he slaves round the necks and fastens the chains to the hosses and makes them walk all the way to Texas. My mother and my sister had to walk. Emma was my sister. Somewhere on the road it went to snowing, and Massa wouldn't let us wrap anything round our feet. We had to sleep on the ground, too, in all that snow.

Massa have a great, long whip platted out of rawhide, and when one the niggers fall behind or give out, he hit him with that whip. It take the hide every time he hit a nigger. Mother, she give out on the way, 'bout the line of Texas. Her feet got raw and bleeding, and her legs swoll plumb out of shape. Then, Massa, he just take out he gun and shot her, and whilst she lay dying

he kicks her two-three times and say, 'Damn a nigger what can't stand nothing.' Boss, you know that man, he wouldn't bury mother, just leave her laying where he shot her at. You know, then there wasn't no law 'gainst killing nigger slaves.

He come plumb to Austin through that snow. He taken up farming and changes he name to Alex Simpson and changes our names, too. He cut logs and builded he home on the side of them mountains. We never had no quarters. When nighttime come, he locks the chain round our necks and then locks it round a tree. Boss, our bed were the ground. All he feed us was raw meat and green corn. Boss, I et many a green weed. I was hungry. He never let us eat at noon, he worked us all day without stopping. We went naked, that the way he worked us. We never had any clothes.

He brands us. He brand my mother before us left Georgia. Boss, that nearly kilt her. He brand her in the breast, then between the shoulders. He brand us all.

My sister, Emma, was the only woman he have till he marries. Emma was wife of all seven Negro slaves. He sold her when she's 'bout fifteen, just before her baby was born. I never seen her since.

Boss, Massa was a outlaw. He come to Texas and deal in stolen hosses. Just before he's hung for stealing hosses, he marries a young Spanish gal. He sure mean to her. Whips her 'cause she want him to leave he slaves alone and live right. Bless her heart, she's the best gal in the world. She was the best thing God ever put life in, in the world. She cry and cry every time Massa go off. She let us a-loose, and she feed us good one time while he's gone. Missy Selena, she turn us a-loose, and we wash in the creek clost by. She just fasten the chain on us and give us great big pot cooked meat and corn, and up he rides. Never says a word but come to see what us eating. He pick up he whip and whip her till she falls. If I could have got a-loose I'd kilt him. I swore if I ever got a-loose I'd kill him. But before long after that he fails to come home, and some people finds him hanging to a tree. Boss, that long after war time he got hung. He didn't let us free. We wore chains all the time.

2. *Narrative of Charley Williams, age 90, Tulsa, Oklahoma.*⁶

Iffen I could see better outen my old eyes, and I had me something to work with and the feebleness in my back and head would let me 'lone, I would have me plenty to eat in the kitchen all the time, and plenty tobacco in my pipe, too, bless God!

And they wouldn't be no rain trickling through the holes in the roof, and no planks all fell outen the floor on the gallery neither, 'cause this one old nigger knows everything about making all he need to git along! Old Master done showed him how to git along in this world, just as long as he live on a plantation, but living in the town is a different way of living, and all you got to have is a silver dime to lay down for everything you want, and I don't git the dime very often.

But I ain't give up! Nothing like that! On the days when I don't feel so feeble and trembly I just keep patching round the place. I got to keep patching so as to keep it where it will hold the winter out, in case I git to see another winter.

Iffen I don't, it don't grieve me none, 'cause I wants to see Old Master again anyways. I reckon maybe I'll just go up and ask him what he want me to do, and he'll tell me, and iffen I don't know how he'll show me how, and I'll try to do it to please him. And when I git it done, I wants to hear him grumble like he used to and say, "Charley, you ain't got no sense but you is a good boy. This here ain't very good but it'll do, I reckon. Git yourself a little piece of that brown sugar, but don't let no niggers see you eating it—if you do I'll whup your black behind!"

That ain't the way it going to be in Heaven, I reckon, but I can't set here on this old rottendy

gallery and think of no way I better like to have it!

I was a great big hulking buck of a boy when the war come along and bust up everything, and I can 'member back when everybody was living peaceful and happy, and nobody never had no notion about no war.

3. *Narrative of Jenny Proctor, age 87, San Angelo, Texas, telling of experiences as a slave in Alabama.*⁷

I's hear to tell of them good slave days, but I ain't never seen no good times then. My mother's name was Lisa, and when I was a very small child I hear that driver going from cabin to cabin as early as 3 o'clock in the morning, and when he comes to our cabin he say, "Lisa, Lisa, git up from there and git that breakfast." My mother, she was cook, and I don't recollect nothing 'bout my father. If I had any brothers and sisters I didn't know it. We had old ragged huts made out of poles and some of the cracks chinked up with mud and moss and some of them wasn't. We didn't have no good beds, just scaffolds nailed up to the wall out of poles and the old ragged bedding throwed on them. That sure was hard sleeping, but even that feel good to our weary bones after them long hard days' work in the fields. I 'tended to the children when I was a little gal and tried to clean the house just like Old Miss tells me to. Then soon as I was ten years old, Old Master, he say, "Git this here nigger to that cotton patch."

I recollects once when I was trying to clean the house like Old Miss tell me, I finds a biscuit, and I's so hungry I et it, 'cause we never see such a thing as a biscuit only sometimes on Sunday morning. We just have corn bread and syrup and sometimes fat bacon, but when I et that biscuit and she comes in and say, "Where that biscuit?" I say, "Miss, I et it 'cause I's so hungry." Then she grab that broom and start beating me over the head with it and calling me low-down nigger, and I guess I just clean lost my head 'cause I knowed better than to fight her if I knowed anything 't all, but I start to fight her, and the driver, he comes in and he grabs me and starts beating me with that cat-o'-nine-tails, and he beats me till I fall to the floor nearly dead. He cut my back all to pieces, then they rub salt in the cuts for more punishment. Lord, Lord, honey! Them was awful days. When Old Master come to the house, he say, "What you beat that nigger like that for?" And the driver tells him why, and he say, "She can't work now for a week. She pay for several biscuits in that time." He sure was mad, and he tell Old Miss she start the whole mess. I still got them scars on my old back right now, just like my grandmother have when she die, and

I's a-carrying mine right on to the grave just like she did.

Our master, he wouldn't 'low us to go fishing—he say that too easy on a nigger and wouldn't 'low us to hunt none either—but sometimes we slips off at night and catch possums. And when Old Master smells them possums cooking 'way in the night, he wraps up in a white sheet and gits in the chimney corner and scratch on the wall, and when the man in the cabin goes to the door and say, "Who's that?" he say, "It's me, what's ye cooking in there?" and the man say, "It's cooking possum." He say, "Cook him and bring me the hindquarters and you and the wife and the children eat the rest." We never had no chance to git any rabbits 'cept when we was a-clearing and grubbing the new ground. Then we catch some rabbits, and if they looks good to the white folks they takes them and if they no good the niggers git them. We never had no gardens. Sometimes the slaves git vegetables from the white folks' garden and sometimes they didn't.

Money? Uh-uh! We never seen no money. Guess we'd-a bought something to eat with it if we ever seen any. Fact is, we wouldn't-a know'd hardly how to bought anything, 'cause we didn't know nothing 'bout going to town.

They spinned the cloth what our clothes was made of, and we had straight dresses or slips made of lowell. Sometimes they dye 'em with sumac berries or sweet-gum bark, and sometimes they didn't. On Sunday they make all the children change, and what we wears till we gits our clothes washed was gunny sacks with holes cut for our head and arms. We didn't have no shoes 'cepting some homemade moccasins, and we didn't have them till we was big children. The little children they goes naked till they was big enough to work. They was soon big enough though, 'cording to our master. We had red flannel for winter under-clothes. Old Miss she say a sick nigger cost more than the flannel.

Weddings? Uh-uh! We just steps over the broom and we's married. Ha! Ha! Ha!

Old Master he had a good house. The logs was all hewed off smooth-like, and the cracks all fixed with nice chinking, plumb 'spectable-looking even to the plank floors. That was something. He didn't have no big plantation, but he keeps 'bout three hundred slaves in them little huts with dirt floors. I think he calls it four farms what he had.

4. *Narrative of Ellen Betts, age 84, Houston, Texas.*⁸

I got borned on the Bayou Teche, clost to Opelousas. That is St. Mary's Parish, in Louisiana, and I belonged to Tolas Parsons, what had 'bout five hundred slaves, counting the big ones and

the little ones, and he had God knows what else. When my eyes just barely fresh open, Marse Tolas die and will the whole lot of us to he brother, William Tolas Parsons. And I tells you that Marse William am the greatest man what ever walk this earth. That's the truth. I can't lie on him when the poor man's in he grave.

When a whupping got to be done, Old Marse do it heself. He don't 'low no overseer to throw he gals down and pull up their dress and whup on their bottoms like I hear tell some of 'em do. Was he still living I 'spect one part of he hands be with him today. I knows I would.

When us niggers go down the road, folks say, "Them's Parsons' niggers. Don't hit one them niggers for God's sake, or Parsons sure eat your jacket up."

Aunt Rachel what cook in the big house for Miss Cornelia had four younguns and them children fat and slick as I ever seen. All the niggers have to stoop to Aunt Rachel just like they curtsy to Missy. I mind the time her husband, Uncle Jim, git mad and hit her over the head with the poker. A big knot raise up on Aunt Rachel's head, and when Marse 'quire 'bout it, she say she done bump the head. She dasn't tell on Uncle Jim or Marse sure beat him. Marse sure proud them black, slick children of Rachel's. You couldn't find a yaller child on his place. He sure got no use for mixing black and white.

Marse William have the prettiest place up and down that bayou, with the fine house and fine trees and such. From where we live it's five miles to Centerville one way and five to Patterson t'other. They hauls the lumber from one place or t'other to make wood houses for the slaves. Sometime Marse buy the furniture, and sometime the carpenter make it.

Miss Sidney was Marse's first wife, and he had six boys by her. Then he marry the widow Cornelia, and she give him four boys. With ten children springing up quick like that and all the colored children coming 'long fast as pig litters, I don't do nothing all my days, but nurse, nurse, nurse. I nurse so many children it done went and stunted my growth, and that's why I ain't nothing but bones to this day.

When the colored women has to cut cane all day till midnight come and after, I has to nurse the babies for them and tend the white children, too. Some them babies so fat and big I had to tote the feet while 'nother gal tote the head. I was such a little one, 'bout seven or eight years old. The big folk leave some toddy for colic and crying and such, and I done drink the toddy and let the children have the milk. I don't know no better. Lawsy me, it's a wonder I ain't the biggest drunker in this here country, counting all the toddy I done put in my young belly!

When late of night come, iffen them babies wake up and bawl, I set up a screech and out-screech them till they shut their mouth. The louder they bawl, the louder I bawl. Sometime when Marse hear the babies cry, he come down and say, "Why the children cry like that, Ellen?" I say, "Marse, I git so hongry and tired I done drink the milk up." When I talk sassy like that, Marse just shake he finger at me, 'cause he knowed I's a good one and don't let no little mite starve.

Nobody ever hit me a lick. Marse always say being mean to the young-uns make them mean when they grows up and nobody gwine to buy a mean nigger. Marse don't even let the children go to the big cane patch. He plant little bitty patches close to the house, and each little nigger have a patch and he work it till it got growed. Marse have the house girls make popcorn for 'em and candy.

Law, I 'lect the time Marse marry Miss Cornelia. He went on the mail boat and brung her from New Orleans. She the prettiest woman in the world almost, 'cepting she have the biggest mouth I nearly ever seed. He brung her up to the house, and all the niggers and boys and girls and cats and dogs and such come and salute her. There she stand on the gallery, with a pretty white dress on with red stripes running up and down. Marse say to her, "Honey, see all the black folks, they 'longs to you now." She wave to us and smile on us, and next day she give her wedding dress to my ma. That the finest dress I ever seen. It was purple and green silk and all the nigger gals wear that

dress when they git marry. My sister Sidney wore it and Sary and Mary.

When a black gal marry, Marse marry her hisself in the big house. He marry 'em Saturday, so they git Sunday off, too. One time the river boat come bearing the license for niggers to git marry with. Marse chase 'em off and say, "Don't you come trucking no no-'count papers round my niggers. When I marry 'em, they marry as good as if the Lord God hisself marry 'em and it don't take no paper to bind the tie." Marse don't stand no messing round, neither. A gal have to be of age and ask her pa and ma and Marse and Missy, and if they 'gree, they go ahead and git marry. Marse have the marry book to put the name down. . . .

Then it seem like Marse have all the trouble in the world. He boy, Ned, die in the war, and William, what name for he pa, drink bad all the time. And after the war them Ku Kluxers what wear the false faces try to tinker with Marse's niggers. One day Uncle Dave start to town, and a Kluxer ask him where am he pass. That Kluxer clout him, but Uncle Dave outrun him in the cane. Marse grab the hoss and go 'rest that man, and Marse a judge, and he make that man pay the fine for hitting Uncle Dave. After they hears of that, them old poky faces sure scared of Old Marse, and they git out from Opelousas and stays out. When me and my husband, John, come to Texas the folks say that Louisiana masters the meanest in the world, and I say right back at 'em that they is good and mean in every spot of the earth.

Part II.

ASPECTS OF SLAVERY

In the broadest sense, slavery existed in the colonies or states which formed the American union for nearly 250 years—that is, from 1619 to 1865. During the last sixty years of its duration, however, it entered a phase which was in many ways unlike the slavery of the colonial and early republican period. During the colonial phase the chief traffic in slaves was the trade from Africa. Because the bulk of the importation took place during the eighteenth century, this meant that a large proportion of the slaves at the time of the Revolution were native Africans. As such they had inherited only an extremely primitive culture, and their life in America gave them only a rudimentary understanding of the language, the economy, the family relationships, the religion, and the techniques of the English-speaking world. In other words they remained, with notable exceptions, more or less savage. These workers were imported to labor in the tobacco fields of Virginia and Maryland and in the rice fields of Carolina; so decidedly were they restricted to these areas that in 1790 five out of every seven slaves in the United States lived in one of these three states. The economy to which they were attached was not a growing economy. The tobacco fields were in many cases beginning to wear out, and forward looking planters like Washington wanted nothing to do with tobacco culture. As for the rice culture, it was semiaquatic in its nature and therefore confined to the narrow coastal area where fields could be flooded by the tidal rivers. In short, the slavery system at the end of the eighteenth century involved Negroes who were more or less directly African; it relied upon the

African trade for its supply of new slaves; and it flourished in a limited area in association with a static part of the economy. It did not appear at that time that slavery faced a very prosperous future; a great many southerners were emancipating their slaves, while many others recognized that the institution was an anomaly which must be eliminated in free America.

One by one these conditions changed. First of all, the African slave trade was abolished. In the Constitutional Convention slave-state and free-state delegates, who could not agree on the question of the trade to Africa, compromised their differences by providing that after twenty years Congress might terminate it. Even before this interval elapsed almost all states outlawed the trade by local action, and in 1808, at the expiration of the twenty years, a federal law prohibited it for the entire union. This, of course, did not prevent the purchase and sale of slaves within the United States, but it virtually ended the trade to Africa, for illegal "blackbirders," smuggled in only a small number of African slaves. The result was that after another fifty years the native Africans were to be found only among the old people, and the slave population actually contained a far higher proportion of native Americans than the free population. While this population remained naïve, superstitious, uneducated, and most imperfectly assimilated to American life, it ceased to have the semisavage character which had existed earlier. The Negroes had become a kind of peasantry.

An equally great change occurred in the economy to which the slaves were attached. In 1793, as every textbook recalls, Eli Whitney invented a cotton gin which made possible the separation of cotton fibers from cottonseed. The English textile industry, at that time the most dynamic economic growth in the world, seized upon this product, and to supply British mills cotton replaced rice and tobacco as the principal staple crop of the South. Like tobacco and rice it lent itself to the use of gang labor on plantation units; unlike them it could be cultivated in a wide range of conditions, from Carolina to Texas. Hence slavery was released from its former confines and in a period of little more than sixty years spread into the upcountry, invaded the backwoods, and planted itself in nine new slave states. By 1860 more than half the slaves were in areas which had not even been enumerated in the census of 1790. This indicated, of course, that slavery had taken a new lease on life as part of an expanding economy. It implied also that the slave population had not been settled in one place but that a domestic or internal trade on a large scale had replaced the former trade to Africa.

These changes involve a number of questions of basic importance in connection with slavery. For one thing, what was the character of the movement by which the whole center of gravity of slavery was shifted southward? Again, what was the actual economic merit of this anomalous system of labor which perpetuated the practices of ancient Egypt at a time when the Industrial Revolution was in full swing? What was the status of those Negroes who were released from slavery? Or still further, what was the attitude of the southern people toward a system which the three greatest southerners—Washington, Jefferson, and Lee—all condemned? The selections will deal with some of these aspects and will conclude with a critique showing how certain of the questions about slavery are still disputed by current historians.

A.

THE DOMESTIC SLAVE TRADE

Between 1800 and 1860 a flood of people, both slave and free, poured into the cotton belt of the lower South. This internal migration formed one of the great population movements in American history. The transfer of free people into this new region can be plotted in detail, for the census showed the number of free persons in each state who were natives of that state and the number born in other states, with a further breakdown to show how many residents of, say, Alabama were born in Maryland, how many in Virginia, how many in South Carolina, and so on. From this it appears that the population of the states from Virginia to Georgia furnished the surplus which streamed into Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas. One can assume that this movement was almost entirely voluntary for the men, more or less voluntary for women and children of the free population.

For the slaves, however, the movement was not voluntary, and the census figures on place of birth are not available. Hence, of the slaves in Alabama in 1850 one can say only that they came of a stock which had been brought in from other states since 1790. Many were natives, even in a new country, for the birth rate was high, but many others had been imported from older states. The latter had been transferred in only two ways: either the master, moving South himself, like Thomas Smith Gregory Dabney, had taken them with him, or they had been sold South. No figures exist to show what proportions fell into each of the two groups, but the sale of slaves to the cotton and sugar belts was great enough to build up all the accompaniments of any large-scale traffic. Slave trading companies were organized in the upper South, with a system of buyers who traveled about the country, and with "jails" in which to accumulate their purchases until a cargo had been assembled. Usually such groups were then shipped to New Orleans or other points by coastal steamers, though slaves were sometimes marched overland in coffles or caravans. At their destination in the lower South other offices existed for receiving and selling the slaves, usually at auction.

Although the exact magnitude of this traffic cannot be ascertained, Frederick Bancroft, in his thorough study entitled *Slave-trading in the Old South* (1931), estimates the total of slaves exported from Virginia alone (including both those sold and those who accompanied their masters) at 11,800 per year from 1830 to 1840. The trade was, in fact, large enough to give rise to a widespread and by no means baseless feeling that Virginia, Maryland, and Kentucky found in the slave trade an important prop to their economy after the prosperity of the tobacco culture began to diminish.

The slave trade was undoubtedly the most inhuman feature of the slavery system. Plantation slavery might assume a patriarchal character, but the traffic never could. Southerners themselves deplored it, tried to minimize its importance, and tended to ostracize the slave-dealer socially. The better type southerners avoided selling slaves when they could and sold only to their neighbors when they could not. But the trade flourished despite this condemnation; auctions took place in every town; advertisements of sales appeared in every paper. When the Abolitionists began their crusade against slavery, they found that the auction block was the most potent emotional symbol of the iniquity of the entire system.

A vivid, and seemingly unbiased, description of a slave auction at Richmond appeared in *Chambers' Monthly Magazine* in 1853.⁹

The exposure of ordinary goods in a store is not more open to the public than are the sales of slaves in Richmond. By consulting the local newspapers, I learned that the sales take place by auction every morning in the offices of certain brokers, who, as I understood by the terms of their advertisements, purchased or received slaves for sale on commission.

Looking about, I observed the office of a commission-agent, and into it I stepped. Conceive the idea of a large shop with two windows, and a door between; no shelving or counters inside; the interior a spacious, dismal apartment, not well swept; the only furniture a desk at one of the windows, and a bench at one side of the shop, three feet high, with two steps to it from the floor. I say, conceive the idea of this dismal-looking place, with nobody in it but three negro children, who, as I entered, were playing at auctioneering each other. An intensely black little negro, of four or five years of age, was standing on the bench, or block, as it is called, with an equally black girl, about a year younger, by his side, whom he was pretending to sell by bids to another black child, who was rolling about the floor.

My appearance did not interrupt the merriment.

The little auctioneer continued his mimic play, and appeared to enjoy the joke of selling the girl, who stood demurely by his side.

"Fifty dolla for de gal—fifty dolla—fifty dolla—I sell dis here fine gal for fifty dolla," was uttered with extraordinary volubility by the woolly-headed urchin, accompanied with appropriate gestures, in imitation, doubtless of the scenes he had seen enacted daily in the spot. I spoke a few words to the little creatures, but was scarcely understood; and the fun went on as if I had not been present: so I left them, happy in rehearsing what was likely soon to be their own fate.

At another office of a similar character, on the opposite side of the street, I was more successful. Already a crowd had met, composed, I should think, of persons mostly from the cotton-plantations of the South. A few were seated near a fire on the right-hand side, and others stood round an iron stove in the middle of the apartment. The whole place had a dilapidated appearance. From a back-window, there was a view into a ruinous court-yard; beyond which, in a hollow, accessible by a side-lane, stood a shabby brick-house, on which the word *Jail* was inscribed in large black letters on a white ground. I imagined

it to be a *dépôt* for the reception of negroes.

On my arrival, and while making these preliminary observations, the lots for sale had not made their appearance. In about five minutes afterwards they were ushered in, one after another, under the charge of a mulatto, who seemed to act as principal assistant. I saw no whips, chains, or any other engine of force. Nor did such appear to be required. All the lots took their seats on two long forms near the stove; none showed any signs of resistance; nor did any one utter a word. Their manner was that of perfect humility and resignation.

As soon as all were seated, there was a general examination of their respective merits, by feeling their arms, looking into their mouths, and investigating the quality of their hands and fingers—this last being evidently an important particular. Yet there was no abrupt rudeness in making these examinations—no coarse or domineering language was employed. The three negro men were dressed in the usual manner—in gray woolen clothing. The woman, with three children, excited my peculiar attention. She was neatly attired, with a colored handkerchief bound around her head, and wore a white apron over her gown. Her children were all girls, one of them a baby at the breast three months old, and the others two and three years of age respectively, rigged out with clean white pinafores. There was not a tear or an emotion visible in the whole party. Everything seemed to be considered as a matter of course; and the change of owners was possibly looked forward to with as much indifference as ordinary hired servants anticipate a removal from one employer to another.

While intending-purchasers were proceeding with personal examinations of the several lots, I took the liberty of putting a few questions to the mother of the children. The following was our conversation:—

"Are you a married woman?"

"Yes, sir."

"How many children have you had?"

"Seven."

"Where is your husband?"

"In Madison county."

"When did you part from him?"

"On Wednesday—two days ago."

"Were you sorry to part from him?"

"Yes, sir," she replied, with a deep sigh; "my heart was a'most broke."

"Why is your master selling you?"

"I don't know—he wants money to buy some land—suppose he sells me for that."

There might not be a word of truth in these answers, for I had no means of testing their correctness; but the woman seemed to speak unreservedly, and I am inclined to think that she said

nothing but what, if necessary, could be substantiated. I spoke, also, to the young woman who was seated near her. She, like the others, was perfectly black, and appeared stout and healthy, of which some of the persons present assured themselves by feeling her arms and ankles, looking into her mouth, and causing her to stand up. She told me she had several brothers and sisters, but did not know where they were. She said she was a house-servant, and would be glad to be bought by a good master—looking at me, as if I should not be unacceptable.

I have said that there was an entire absence of emotion in the party of men, women, and children, thus seated preparatory to being sold. This does not correspond with the ordinary accounts of slave-sales, which are represented as tearful and harrowing. My belief is, that none of the parties felt deeply on the subject, or at least that any distress they experienced was but momentary—soon passed away, and was forgotten. One of my reasons for this opinion rests on a trifling incident which occurred. While waiting for the commencement of the sale, one of the gentlemen present amused himself with a pointer-dog, which, at command, stood on its hind-legs, and took pieces of bread from his pocket. These tricks greatly entertained the row of negroes, old and young; and the poor woman, whose heart three minutes before was almost broken, now laughed as heartily as any one.

"Sale is going to commence—this way, gentlemen," cried a man at the door to a number of loungers outside; and all having assembled, the mulatto assistant led the woman and her children to the block, which he helped her to mount. There she stood with her infant at the breast, and one of her girls at each side. The auctioneer, a handsome, gentlemanly personage, took his place, with one foot on an old deal chair with a broken back, and the other raised on the somewhat more elevated block. It was a striking scene.

"Well, gentlemen," began the salesman, "here is a capital woman and her three children, all in good health—what do you say for them? Give me an offer. (Nobody speaks.) I put up the whole lot at 850 dollars—850 dollars—850 dollars (speaking very fast)—850 dollars. Will no one advance upon that? A very extraordinary bargain, gentlemen. A fine, healthy baby. Hold it up. (Mulatto goes up the first step of the block; takes the baby from the woman's breast, and holds it aloft with one hand, so as to show that it was a veritable sucking baby.) That will do. A woman, still young, and three children, all for 850 dollars. An advance, if you please, gentlemen. (A voice bids 860.) Thank you, sir, 860; any one bids more? (A second voice says, 870; and so on the bidding goes as far as 890 dollars, when it stops.) That won't do, gentlemen. I

cannot take such a low price. (After a pause, addressing the mulatto): She may go down." Down from the block the woman and her children were therefore conducted by the assistant, and, as if nothing had occurred, they calmly resumed their seats by the stove.

The next lot brought forward was one of the men. The mulatto, beckoning to him with his hand, requested him to come behind a canvas screen, of two leaves, which was standing near the back window. The man placidly rose, and having been placed behind the screen, was ordered to take off his clothes, which he did without a word or look of remonstrance. About a dozen gentlemen crowded to the spot while the poor fellow was stripping himself, and as soon as he stood on the floor, bare from top to toe, a most rigorous scrutiny of his person was instituted. The clear black skin, back and front, was viewed all over for sores from disease; and there was no part of his body left unexamined. The man was told to open and shut his hands, asked if he could pick cotton, and every tooth in his head was scrupulously looked at. The investigation being at an end, he was ordered to dress himself; and having done so, was requested to walk to the block.

The ceremony of offering him was gone through as before, but no one would bid. The other two men, after undergoing similar examinations behind the screen, were also put up, but with the same result. Nobody would bid for them, and they were all sent back to their seats. It seemed as if the company had conspired not to buy anything that day. Probably some imperfections had been detected in the personal qualities of the negroes. Be this as it may, the auctioneer, perhaps a little out of temper from his want of success, walked off to his desk, and the affair was so far at an end.

"This way, gentlemen—this way!" was heard from a voice outside, and the company immediately hived off to the second establishment.

[At the next office a little Negro boy is offered for sale.]

"Come along, my man—jump up; there's a good

boy!" said one of the partners, a bulky and respectable-looking person, with a gold chain and bunch of seals; at the same time getting on the block. With alacrity the little fellow came forward, and, mounting the steps, stood by his side.

"Now, gentlemen," said the auctioneer, putting his hand on the shoulder of the boy, "here is a very fine boy, seven years of age, warranted sound—what do you say for him? I put him up at 500 dollars—500 dollars (speaking quick, his right hand raised up, and coming down on the open palm of his left)—500 dollars. Any one say more than 500 dollars? (560 is bid.) 560 dollars. Nonsense! Just look at him. See how high he is. (He draws the lot in front of him, and shows that the little fellow's head comes up to his breast.) You see he is a fine, tall, healthy boy. Look at his hands."

Several step forward, and cause the boy to open and shut his hands—the flexibility of the small fingers, black on the one side and whitish on the other, being well looked to. The hands, and also the mouth, having given satisfaction, an advance is made to 570, then to 580 dollars.

"Gentlemen, that is a very poor price for a boy of this size. (Addressing the lot)—Go down, my boy, and show them how you can run."

The boy, seemingly happy to do as he was bid, went down from the block, and ran smartly across the floor several times; the eyes of every one in the room following him.

"Now that will do. Get up again. (Boy mounts the block, the steps being rather deep for his short legs; but the auctioneer kindly lends him a hand.) Come, gentlemen, you see this is a first-rate lot. (590–600–610–620–630 dollars are bid.) I will sell him for 630 dollars. (Right hand coming down on left.) Last call. 630 dollars, once—630 dollars, twice. (A pause; hand sinks.) gone!"

Such were a forenoon's experiences in the slave-market of Richmond. Everything is described precisely as it occurred, without passion or prejudice. It would not have been difficult to be sentimental on a subject which appeals so strongly to the feelings; but I have preferred telling the simple truth.

B. THE ECONOMICS OF SLAVERY

Whenever people become emotionally concerned with the moral aspects of a question, they tend to treat every feature of the question in conformity with their moral attitude rather than in the light of the available facts. This tendency appeared when men turned to the question of the economic efficiency of slavery. It is of course possible that a practice might be very wrong morally and at the same time very profitable financially. But critics of slavery, wishing to condemn it on as many counts as possible, constantly insisted that it was a major economic liability to the South. It is a point of some interest that of the two antislavery books which outstripped all others in publicity and circulation, one, *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, developed the moral issue, while the other, Hinton R. Helper's *The Im-*

pending Crisis, showed no sympathy for slaves but condemned the institution for its effect in impairing southern economic development.

This view of slavery gained much plausibility from the fact that the southern states, starting almost abreast of the northern states, failed to match the phenomenal economic progress of the North—in fact, fell steadily farther behind in wealth, productive capacity, trade, etc. Here was ground for a simple—perhaps too simple—logical syllogism: the South had slavery; the South was retarded economically; therefore slavery retarded economic development. Undoubtedly there was a measure of truth in this conclusion. The slave laborer, it was said, was wasteful and unskilled because he lacked incentive to be otherwise. His wastefulness, the argument continued, meant the loss of soil through careless cultivation; his status prevented free workers from coming into the South, where manual labor was not respected; his lack of skill meant that the South could not turn to industry or even to the more exacting forms of agriculture, and thus the one-crop system fastened its tentacles upon the region.

These contentions, no doubt, had some validity, but certain other factors undoubtedly contributed to the result. For instance, the heavy rains of the South make erosion a greater problem there than in higher latitudes, and the lack of glacial action has limited the fertility of southern soil. This meant a problem of soil conservation quite apart from slavery. As for the alleged soil wastage by slaves, it is unlikely that Negro workers, toiling under the eye of their master, ever abused land resources as recklessly as did free pioneers who “skinned the soil” both North and South. It is also questionable whether skilled labor alone would have brought textile factories to the South at a time when the industry still depended upon rapid flowing streams for power and upon natural humidity for the best results in the spinning process. The South achieved industrialization later when electric power and artificial humidification neutralized the handicaps of sluggish rivers and dry atmosphere; southern textile mills have never employed any appreciable number of Negroes, either slave or free. Other handicaps of the old South, such as its inferior transportation system, although sometimes attributed to slavery, can be better explained in terms of the low density of population; where there are few people in a given area to ship freight, it becomes unprofitable to build a railroad for them. Most important of all, the South produced raw materials in the form of cotton fibers, and, whether regions of such production use slave or free labor, they seem always to be exploited by manufacturing and commercial areas.

The North prided itself on its free labor and condemned the cheap slave labor of the South, yet in a sense it was the North which used cheap labor—that is, water and steam power applied to machinery—while the South used costly labor—the human labor of slaves. It may well be argued that slavery was abolished in the nineteenth century not because of moral progress but because a cheaper form of labor was becoming available.

It must not be supposed that the Abolitionists were the only spokesmen of the theory that slavery was economically obsolete. After the Civil War southerners came to concede that slavery ought to have been abolished. But not wishing to admit that a war against slavery had been justified, they began to develop the argument that since slavery was economically unprofitable it would have fallen into disuse and become extinct about 1900. Hence, they contended, the war had been needless.

All these generalized arguments about the inefficiency of slavery are involved with moral attitudes and they seldom get down to the specific question whether landowners could have found another form of labor that could have raised cotton at a lower cost per pound than resulted from the use of slaves. Until they could, slavery was not economically doomed. The whole question clearly needs cold, analytical examination in the light of unemotional economics.

One of the few attempts to examine in a detached way the economic survival value of slavery is found in a study by Lewis C. Gray.¹⁰

The tendency for slave labor to displace free labor where conditions were favorable to producing and marketing the staples raises the question as to what economic characteristics gave slavery the advantage. Obviously this question involves neither the ethical aspects of slavery nor its social

and economic advantages and disadvantages from the standpoint of national or sectional welfare. Unfortunately, however, the consideration of the economic aspects of slavery as a competitive institution have been largely mixed up with these broader considerations, resulting in a large amount

of dogmatism and confusing seriously the nature of competition between the respective types of labor. The essential question is not whether the South would have been better off if its entire population had been made up of white laborers of west European origin working under the wages system; but whether the South could have employed the African negro, after he was brought to this country, in any more effective manner, and more than this, why the negro slave, in spite of the alleged inferiority of slavery as a method of stimulating exertion, was able to displace the economy of free white farmers.

There has been a tendency to confuse the industrial qualities peculiar to negro labor with the industrial incapacity attributable to the influence of slavery. This confusion has been largely the outgrowth of the arbitrary assumption that slave labor must be less economic because it is given grudgingly and half-heartedly. Turgot and Adam Smith promulgated this dogma, and it soon became a commonplace of economic generalization. Francis A. Walker gave the formula an eloquent presentation. The "whip," he wrote, "only stimulates the flesh on which it is laid. It does not reach the parts of a man where lie the springs of action. No brutality of rule can evoke even the whole physical power of a human being."

One essential fallacy of Smith and his followers was in assuming that if slave labor was less efficient in terms of physical performance than free labor, it must therefore be "dearer." The two things are not necessarily identical. Even though white labor be superior to negro slave labor in economic skill and adaptability, it is conceivable that the superior cheapness of the negro slave might result in enabling the master to outbid white labor in competition for land or to undersell it in disposal of products.

As to the relative efficiency of negro slave labor and free white labor employed for field operations in the production of Southern staples, the evidence is conflicting. There were a good many planters and employers who preferred negro slaves to white laborers. There were travelers who commented on the volume of work accomplished by negro slaves under the plantation system. On the other hand, there were observers who noted the carelessness and slipshod character of negro slave labor. A writer in the *American Farmer* declared, "There is perhaps not in Nature a more heedless, thoughtless human being than a Virginia field negro. With no care upon his mind, with warm clothing and plenty of food, under a good master, he is far the happier man of the two. His maxim is, 'Come day, go day, God send Sunday.'" Frederick Law Olmsted was impressed with repeated instances of waste and carelessness, especially in regions where plantation

organization was least well developed. He mentions, for instance, "gates left open and bars left down, against standing orders; rails removed from fences by the negroes, as was conjectured, to kindle their fires with; mules lamed, and implements broken, by careless usage; a flat-boat, carelessly secured, going adrift on the river; men ordered to cart rails for a new fence, depositing them so that a double expense of labor would be required to lay them, more than would have been needed if they had been placed, as they might almost as easily have been, by a slight exercise of forethought; men ordered to fill up holes made by alligators or craw-fish in an important embankment, discovered to have merely patched over the outside, having taken pains only to make it appear that they had executed their task—not having been overlooked while doing it, by a driver; men, not having performed duties that were entrusted to them, making statements which their owner was obliged to receive as sufficient excuse, though, he told me, he felt assured they were false—all going to show habitual carelessness, indolence, and mere eye-service."

Unquestionably Olmsted exaggerated the responsibility of slavery for these characteristics, which are frequently displayed by free negro laborers, even when working for themselves. It is further probable that a part of the carelessness and shiftlessness observed by Olmsted and others resulted from the lax supervision and easygoing spirit of interior regions where the economy was not predominantly commercial. Even Olmsted was impressed with the steadiness, strength, and effectiveness of negro labor under systematic direction in the capitalistic cotton plantations of the Southwest. Specific contemporary estimates of accomplishment not infrequently indicate as large an average for slaves as for free laborers. Furthermore, statistics of wages paid for white labor compared with payments for slaves hired do not reflect an unquestionable tendency to evaluate one kind of labor higher than the other.

Slavery as an industrial system possessed certain positive advantages, even as compared with the system of wage labor. From the standpoint of the employer, slavery provided a stable labor supply. Barring ordinary accidents and sickness, the laborer's services were always available—an important advantage in large-scale farming. There was possibly a certain degree of economic inelasticity in the supply of labor, particularly at harvest time, when there was little surplus labor except children; and slave labor probably flowed less readily than free labor to the type of employment involving greatest economic opportunity, due largely to lack of diversity in the negro's economic experience. It was found practicable to employ slave women in field labor, as well as

men, while throughout America custom did not ordinarily sanction the employment of white women in the fields. Furthermore, it was practicable to use child labor from a comparatively early age in such activities as worming and suckering tobacco and picking cotton. Slavery involved no problem of unemployment, and bred no lock-outs, blacklists, or strikes.

An understanding of the reasons for the competitive superiority of slave labor as compared with free labor in regions favorable to the commercial production of staples rests on a comparatively simple basis. In the New World, with its abundance of fertile land, labor, when employed with a reasonable degree of efficiency, could produce a volume of physical goods larger than the bare requisites of its subsistence from birth to death. The owner of the slave had legally appropriated his services for life, and therefore was in a position to appropriate the surplus above the requisites of subsistence. Of course, land, equipment, and supervision were necessary to employ this labor productively, but these requisites exist also in the employment of free labor. The physical surplus might disappear for a time on account of crop failure, and price fluctuations might also cause the surplus to vanish for short periods, but

normally there was both a physical and a value surplus for the full lifetime of the slave, which was appropriable by reason of the institution of slavery.

It was this appropriable surplus that gave slave labor under plantation organization an irresistible ability to displace free labor, whether hired or engaged in production on family-sized farms. Substantially, the minimum level of competition in the case of slave labor was bare subsistence. The planter was able, if necessary, to produce at price levels which left little more than the expense of maintaining the slave. White labor could bid no lower. As a matter of fact, however, the basis of competition rarely reached so low a level. There were extensive areas of fertile land where white labor could find an outlet for its energies without coming into acute competition with slave labor. Where free white labor did come into direct competition with slave labor in the South there resulted the process of geographical segregation already pointed out. The possession of areas suitable to the marketing of products was of vital importance to the owner of slaves, for otherwise he could enjoy the surplus product of their labor only in the form of a food surplus, which it was impossible to consume, or in an excess of personal services.

C.

FREE NEGROES

All American slaves were of Negro descent, wholly or partially, and since all slaves could be said to be Negroes, it is easy to assume that all Negroes were slaves. This, however, was far from true. In the year 1850 Maryland had 84,000 free Negroes; Virginia 54,000; and the other slave states numbers ranging from 27,000 in North Carolina to 397 in Texas. The total in the slave states amounted to 238,190, which was a little more than half the number of free Negroes in the United States. The situation of these unfortunates who belonged by law with the free, by kinship with the slave, and by the system with neither is described in the following selection by Ulrich B. Phillips, a major authority on American Negro slavery.¹¹

"Free persons of color" were an unintended but inevitable by-product of the recourse to Negro labor. Brethren to the slaves, and some of them unacknowledged half-brethren of the whites, they were an increasing complication. A few Negroes attained freedom in early Virginia because the first comers, imported before definite slavery was established, were dealt with as if they had been indentured servants. Others here and there were manumitted by benevolent masters for meritorious service or in compliance with scruples of conscience; and a small number of mulattoes born of white mothers were free by birth. As long as Negroes and mulattoes of every status were but a small part of the population and constituted no public social problem, the free group gave little concern. But no sooner did the number of slaves

evoke a special system of police than the free Negroes began to be considered a menace. The closing decades of the seventeenth century brought the first laws to check manumission and miscegenation, and the eighteenth began their definite exclusion from the voting suffrage and the militia.

The libertarian fervor of the Revolution swept away some of these laws and prompted a multitude of private manumissions at the South as well as the legal disestablishment of slavery in all the States north of Delaware. But problems of order came in quick sequel to independence. The free Negroes, who numbered some sixty thousand in 1790, were nearly doubled in 1800 and, thanks to Louisiana's addition, were more than thrice as many in 1810. By 1830, when Garrison's agitation intensified the reaction, they exceeded three

hundred thousand, the larger half distributed as neighbors to the two million slaves in the South. As these and later decades passed, the restraints of aforetime were imposed afresh and variously supplemented. Influx from abroad and from sister States was forbidden; manumission if permitted at all was conditioned upon removal; and the free Negroes on hand were required to register, pay fees, and procure guardians and licenses. With plans for promoting their emigration to such distant havens as Liberia bearing little fruit, and projects for general expulsion coming to naught, the laws more and more bracketed free Negroes with the slaves in restricting education, testimony, peregrination and employment.

The grounds for these drastic restraints were official apprehensions of several sorts: that through vagrancy, vice and mere indolence the free Negroes must be an economic burden; that social exclusion from white circles must needs make them discontented; that their sense of grievance would ally them with the slaves in plots for upheaval; and if educated and free to travel they would be most effective conspirators. As methods were revealed or imagined by which these people might injure the whites whether as mere business competitors, as receivers of stolen goods and sellers of liquor to slaves, or as teachers and preachers of incendiary notions, one restrictive statute followed another to make them the more surely passive.

In unofficial opinion severity of legislation was often deprecated. For example, a Charleston editor said of the local free colored people, their conduct "has been for the most part so correct, evincing so much civility, subordination, industry and propriety, that unless their conduct should change for the worse, or some stern necessity de-

mand it, we are unwilling to see them deprived of those immunities which they have enjoyed for centuries without the slightest detriment to the commonwealth." In fact, almost with one accord, they were the most acquiescent of mankind. Aware fully that they dwelt upon sufferance and that in any embroilment disaster was assured unless a white protector were enlisted, they were obsequiously self-effacing and readily compliant with every public or private demand. Indeed their main vices, aside from idleness, were those of concubines or procurers in gratification of white men's lusts. Some prospered from these employments, and others, as barbers, cabmen, mechanics, merchants, fishermen or farmers. A few became slaveholders of plantation scale, and some were soldiers of acknowledged service in the Revolution and the War of 1812. Some had the manners of Chesterfield and the diction of Samuel Johnson. Of high degree were these in the sharply defined strata of urban colored society. Others, more numerous, were thriftless, inert underlings, content if they could find jobs which no others wanted, and accustomed to live without seeking steady means of support. These were slaves by nature or habit, "loud laughers in the hands of fate," who had been cast loose in misguided philanthropy.

Ranging as they did in complexion from a tinged white to full black, in costume from Parisian finery to many-colored patches, in culture from serene refinement to sloven superstitious uncouthness, these people showed a diverse reflection of the patterns presented by the other groups in the community. Originating nothing, they complied in all things that they might live as a third element in a system planned for two.

D.

SOUTHERN OPINION ON SLAVERY

Slavery was scarcely regarded as a moral question except by the Quakers until the late eighteenth century. Yankee shipowners of the Colonial period trafficked in slaves without the least impairment of their Puritan piety, and all of the thirteen colonies legally permitted slavery. The only distinction was between those colonies which found slavery advantageous in their economy and used it on a large scale and those which, having no functional need for it, used it on a negligible scale.

About the time of the American Revolution, however, opinion on the subject began to change throughout the world. The churches began to give less attention to theological questions and somewhat more to the welfare of individuals (a development which will be examined in Problem VII). The new libertarian trends of the age, which found expression in the Enlightenment, the American Revolution, and the French Revolution, developed a doctrine of human rights that could not be reconciled with slavery. To an increasing degree governments moved against it. A judicial decision in England in 1772 resulted in the liberation of more than 14,000 slaves in that country. In America abolition began in 1777 and extended throughout the northern states by 1804. In the French colonies freedom for the blacks followed in the wake of the French Revolution, although slavery was later partially restored and not finally ended until 1848. Mexico freed her

slaves in 1829; Denmark freed the slaves in her colonies in 1848. By the 1860s slavery survived only in the Dutch and Portuguese colonies, Brazil, Cuba, and the southern United States. Meanwhile, the international slave trade had been put under ban by virtually all civilized countries.

In the adoption of principles of liberty the Americans were pioneers, and none were more enthusiastic than the Virginians of the Revolutionary generation. Moreover, they applied these principles explicitly to slavery. Washington provided in his will for the emancipation of his slaves; Jefferson condemned the institution and sought to secure legislative action against it in Virginia; James Monroe became president of a society whose objective was the manumission of the slaves and their return to a Negro republic in Africa. At that time no effort was made to justify the institution on ethical grounds or as a permanent system; apologists were content to point out that the evil was too deeply embedded in the social structure to be easily eliminated. Scarcely anyone doubted that slavery was a waning institution, soon to be overtaken by the march of progress.

This view seems to have continued until about 1830. At that time a number of developments converged to bring about a change in the attitude of the South. First of all a violent slave insurrection occurred in 1831 in Southampton County, Virginia, and was not suppressed until fifty-five white persons had been killed. This aroused in acute form a fear of servile revolt which was always latent in the minds of the slaveowners. The revolts in Santo Domingo after the French Revolution, for instance, had sent a spasm of horror throughout the South. The revolt in 1831, therefore, would have led to a repressive reaction in any case, but it caused additional tension because it came just at the time when the Abolitionists turned from persuasive arguments to a violent denunciation of slavery and slaveowners. In this same year William Lloyd Garrison began the publication of *The Liberator*, which castigated the institution in extreme terms, automatically inspiring a defensive attitude on the part of slaveowners and leading them to fear that antislavery doctrines of any kind would foment revolt.

In part, therefore, the proslavery philosophy which developed was a response to the new direction of the antislavery movement. But another factor which any Abolitionist would hasten to point out was that the rapid growth of the cotton economy, causing high prices and an acute need for slave labor in the Cotton Belt, had rejuvenated the institution economically. Did this mean then that the people of the South defended slavery simply because they held property in it? So it may be argued, but an alert critic will note one important qualification: the majority of southern people did not own slave property to defend and were not members of families which did. In 1850, with a total of 6,222,000 white people in the South, representing certainly more than 1,000,000 families, there were 345,239 slaveholders. Of this number only about 35,000 held more than twenty slaves. Yet the nonslaveholders, the men who had no direct financial stake in the institution, supported slavery zealously; when the Civil War came, they served in the Confederate army, fighting as fiercely, by and large, as the slaveowners. The motivation of these nonslaveholders is a matter of peculiar interest.

In 1832 Thomas R. Dew, a professor at the College of William and Mary, wrote a tract entitled "Review of the Debate in the Virginia Legislature." This boldly asserted that slavery had been and would continue to be a benefit to all—to slaves as well as masters. The publication of Dew's defense signalized the beginning of a new period during which the South was to defend slavery stoutly, in theory and in practice. The defense took many forms. It was seriously contended that the Negro was biologically inferior to the white and indeed that he did not belong to the same species as *homo sapiens*. Other arguments claimed a religious justification for slavery or held that it was economically no worse than the wage system of labor or defended it as part of the division of functions necessary for our advanced society. Further, special arguments were adduced to appeal to the nonslaveholding southerner. All of these contentions, except the first, are developed in the following selections.

1. *The Biblical Defense of Slavery.* Perhaps no proslavery argument circulated so widely and so constantly as the contention that human bondage was approved by the Bible and therefore by God. At a time when every verse

of the Bible was accepted literally as the revealed word of God, this argument could be made very impressive, and the Scriptures could be combed for appropriate texts in the same way in which a lawyer searches the

record of court cases for decisions which help to prove his case. The Biblical argument is summarized effectively in William S. Jenkins, *Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South*.¹²

Broadly, the Biblical arguments may be divided chronologically into those taken from the Old Testament and those found in the New Testament. First came the argument of divine decree. God had decreed slavery before it had actually come into existence: "And he said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren" (Genesis IX:25). Then followed the argument of divine sanction. God had ordained and sanctioned the practice of holding slaves throughout the Patriarchal period. The Patriarchs from Abraham to Moses were large slaveholders who counted their slaves among their goods, as they did their oxen, their horses, and their camels. Abraham held many slaves and he had been exalted to be the father of the chosen people (Genesis XIV:14). The same was true of Jacob (Genesis XXX:43). God, moreover, had ordained the relation of slavery in the covenant entered into with Abraham: "And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations; he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed" (Genesis XVII:12). God sanctioned it through his angel when the runaway slave, Hagar, was commanded to return to her mistress Sarah (Genesis XVI:9).

During the period of the legal dispensation extending from the time of Moses to the time of Christ, the Jews lived under a written constitution of government given to them by the Lord. Under it the practice of slaveholding was not only recognized but its protection provided for. The Mosaic law distinguished between the servitude of a Hebrew and that of an alien. The Jew was a servant to the Jew for six years only or until the sabbatical jubilee when he was to go out free (Exodus XXI:2-8; Leviticus XXV:39-43; Deuteronomy XV:12). His status was different also in that he was treated rather as a hired servant than with the full rigor of the treatment accorded a slave. There was a definite authorization, however, for holding persons in slavery who were taken from among non-believers.

"Both thy bondmen, and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids.

"Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land: and they shall be your possession.

"And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a

possession; they shall be your bondmen for ever: but over your brethren, the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigour (Leviticus XXV:44-46)."

This passage of scripture was the rock of Gibraltar in the Old Testament case; it was used in all of the Biblical defenses from the earliest to the last. The edict was a most important cog in the pro-slavery argument because it authorized buying, selling, holding and bequeathing slaves as property. Hitherto the relation rested on the custom of the Patriarchs. Here it received positive law sanction. Joshua, the successor of Moses, applied the Levitical law when he made the conquered Gibeonites "hewers of wood and drawers of water" (Joshua IX:27).

If the Levitical law was a dispensation for the Hebrew nation alone, the Decalogue was God's revelation to all men for all time, rising above temporary and positive precepts and pronouncing the sum of duties in human relationships. In the Fourth Commandment the authority of the master over the servant was enjoined in the same manner as that of the parent over the child. In the Tenth Commandment the servant or slave was catalogued along with the other types of property in which the rights of the owner were protected against the covetous. . . .

Arguments drawn from the New Testament, or the Christian dispensation strengthened the scriptural justification of slavery. Christ came to fulfill and not to destroy. Therefore, He sanctioned the institutions and relationships existing at His time which He did not expressly condemn. Notwithstanding the fact that slavery flourished in every known part of the world and that Christ and the Apostles were continually coming into contact with it, He did not condemn it in the Sermon on the Mount or in any other formal enumeration of sins given by Him or the Apostles. Certainly had they considered it an evil they would have stated so. On the other hand, Christ tacitly approved it on the occasion when he healed the slave of the Roman centurion while he spoke no word of freedom (Luke VII:2-10). Finally, in the precepts of the New Testament, the Apostles taught submission of the slave to his master, and by so doing recognized the relation as being compatible with Christianity. The example made most use of was taken from the epistle of St. Paul where he tells the story of sending back the runaway slave, Onesimus, to his master Philemon. On many other occasions the Apostles exhorted the slave to be obedient and abide peacefully by his lot.

2. *The Wage Slavery Argument.* A second important weapon in the proslavery arsenal was the claim that the contrast between "slavery" and "freedom" was unreal, that men every-

where were compelled to toil, and that in many ways the condition of the chattel worker in the South compared favorably with the condition of the wage worker in other parts of the world. James Henry Hammond of South Carolina stated this view of the matter in a letter to a British abolitionist.¹³

You think it a great "crime" that we do not pay our slaves "wages," and on this account pronounce us "robbers." In my former letter I showed that the labor of our slaves was not without great cost to us, and that in fact they themselves receive more in return for it than your hirelings do for theirs. For what purpose do men labor, but to support themselves and their families in what comfort they are able? The efforts of mere physical labor seldom suffice to provide more than a livelihood. And it is a well known and shocking fact, that while few operatives in Great Britain succeed in securing a comfortable living, the greater part drag out a miserable existence, and sink at last under absolute want. What avail is it when you go through the form of paying them a pittance of what you call "wages," when you do not, in return for their services, allow them what alone they ask—and have a just right to demand—enough to feed, clothe and lodge them, in health and sickness, with reasonable comfort. Though we do not give "wages" in money, we do this for *our slaves*, and they are therefore better rewarded than *yours*. It is the prevailing vice and error of the age, and one from which the Abolitionists, with all their saintly pretensions, are far from being free, to bring everything to the standard of money. You make gold and silver the great test of happiness. The American slave must be wretched indeed, because he is not compensated for his services *in cash*. It is altogether praiseworthy to pay the laborer a shilling a day, and let him starve on it. To supply all his wants abundantly, and at all times, yet withhold from him money, is among "the most reprobated crimes." The fact cannot be denied, that the mere laborer is now and always has been, everywhere that barbarism has ceased enslaved. Among the innovations of modern times following "the decay of villeinage," has been the creation of a new system of slavery. The primitive and patriarchal, which may also be called the sacred and natural system, in which the laborer is under the personal control of a fellow being endowed with the sentiments and sympathies of humanity, exists among us. It has been almost everywhere else superseded by the modern artificial *money power system*, in which man—his thews and sinews, his hopes and affections, his very being, are all subjected to the dominion of *Capital*—a monster without a heart—cold, stern, arithmetical—sticking to the bond—

taking ever "the pound of flesh,"—working up human life with Engines, and retailing it out by weight and measure.

3. *The Greek Democracy Argument.* Closely related to the southern comparisons of wage slavery and chattel slavery was the broader contention that, since every society requires menial labor, it is better to train one class for leadership and another for labor than to throw society into a fierce competitive struggle to determine which individuals will occupy the higher and which the lower status. This idea of erecting a limited democracy upon a foundation of servitude involved a comparison with the system of ancient Athens and is sometimes called the "Greek Democracy" argument. It was stated by John C. Calhoun in a Senate speech on February 6, 1837.¹⁴

I hold that in the present state of civilization, where two races of different origin, and distinguished by color, and other physical differences, as well as intellectual, are brought together, the relation now existing in the slaveholding States between the two, is, instead of an evil, a good—a positive good. I feel myself called upon to speak freely upon the subject where the honor and interests of those I represent are involved. I hold then, that there never has yet existed a wealthy and civilized society in which one portion of the community did not, in point of fact, live on the labor of the other. Broad and general as is this assertion, it is fully borne out by history. This is not the proper occasion, but if it were, it would not be difficult to trace the various devices by which the wealth of all civilized communities has been so unequally divided, and to show by what means so small a share has been allotted to those by whose labor it was produced, and so large a share given to the non-producing classes. The devices are almost innumerable, from the brute force and gross superstition of ancient times, to the subtle and artful fiscal contrivances of modern. I might well challenge a comparison between them and the more direct, simple, and patriarchal mode by which the labor of the African race is, among us, commanded by the European. I may say with truth, that in few countries so much is left to the share of the laborer, and so little exacted from him, or where there is more kind attention paid to him in sickness or infirmities of age. Compare his condition with the tenants of the poor houses in the more civilized portions of Europe—look at the sick, and the old and infirm slave, on one hand, in the midst of his family and friends, under the kind superintending care of his master and mistress, and compare it with the forlorn and wretched condition of the pauper in the poor house. But I will not dwell on this

aspect of the question; I turn to the political; and here I fearlessly assert that the existing relation between the two races in the South, against which these blind fanatics are waging war, forms the most solid and durable foundation on which to rear free and stable political institutions. It is useless to disguise the fact. There is and always has been in an advanced stage of wealth and civilization, a conflict between labor and capital. The condition of society in the South exempts it from the disorders and dangers resulting from this conflict; and which explains why it is that the political condition of the slaveholding States has been so much more stable and quiet than that of the North.

4. *The Attitude of Nonslaveholders.* Several of the selections above have indicated reasons which were commonly advanced to prove that slavery was justified. But men will not defend an institution merely for the negative reason that it is not in their estimation wrong. No one can believe that ordinary southerners, especially nonslaveholders, supported slavery as zealously as they did because of Biblical texts or ethnological hypotheses or the faults of the wage-labor system or theories about the structure of society. In some way they felt that slavery was a necessary part of the system in which they lived. Some nonslaveholders, no doubt, anticipated the future ownership of slaves, but many must have defended it without such expectations. Abolitionists were always bewildered and annoyed by the loyalty of the nonslaveholders to the slave system. Some light on their motivation is to be found in a speech of Albert G. Brown of Mississippi delivered in the United States Senate, December 22, 1856. Brown was responding to a speech in which William H. Seward of New York had suggested that the nonslaveholders of the South might be expected to turn against a system which was of advantage only to the wealthy and aristocratic.¹⁵

There are three hundred and fifty thousand slaveholding aristocrats in the South, says the senator—men at war with liberty, and dangerous to the republic. They are only one in one hundred of the entire population; or if you add, he says, “the children, relatives, and dependants, they are one in fifteen;” consequently fourteen parts out of every fifteen of the entire population have no interest in slavery. They are, as he seems to conclude, mere hewers of wood and drawers of water to the slaveholding aristocrats.

These suggestions come from no friendly spirit, Mr. President. They open a wide field for speculation; and if I did not feel there was a necessity for my being brief, I would ask the senator to join me in a ramble through that field. To him it is not a field of treasures, as he supposes. If he expects, by appeals like these, to turn the hearts of the non-slaveholders of the South against slavery, he will miss his aim. They may have no pecuniary interest in slavery, but they have a social interest at stake that is worth more to them than all the wealth of all the Indies. Suppose the senator shall succeed in his ideas of universal abolition—what is to be the social condition of the races in the South? Can they live together in peace? No one pretends to think they can. Will the white man be allowed to maintain his superiority there? Let us examine this proposition. There are in my state about three hundred and fifty thousand whites, and about an equal number of blacks. Suppose the negroes were all set free. What would be the immediate and necessary consequence? A struggle for the supremacy would instantly ensue. White immigration to the state would cease of course. The whites already there would have but little motive to struggle in the maintenance of the unequal contest between the blacks and their millions of sympathizing friends in the free states. The consequence would be that the men of fortune would gather up their transferable property, and seek a home in some other country. The poor men—those of little means—the very men on whom the senator relies to aid him in carrying out his great scheme of emancipation, would alone be compelled to remain: their poverty, and not their will, would compel them to remain. In the course of a few years, with no one going to the state, and thousands on thousands leaving it in one constant stream, the present equilibrium between the races would be lost. In a few years, the disparity would probably be some three, four, or five to one in favor of the blacks. In this state of things, it is not difficult to see what would be the white man's condition. If he should be allowed to maintain his equality he might think himself fortunate; superiority would be a thing not to be dreamed of. The negroes being vastly in the majority, would probably claim the ascendancy in the social, and in all other circles. If the white man, reduced to such a condition, were allowed to marry his sons to negro wives, or his daughters to negro husbands, he might bless his stars. If the senator from New York expects the aid of non-slaveholders in the South in bringing about this state of social relations, let me tell him he is greatly mistaken.

E.

APPRAISALS OF SLAVERY BY MODERN HISTORIANS

The preceding readings, especially those in Part I of this problem, have provided some descriptions of and conclusions on slavery by those who were personally witnesses of the institution. In their accounts there is the widest diversity of views. It might be supposed that, as the passage of time provided perspective, historians would be able to reach an agreement as to the nature of slavery. This, however, is not the case, and disagreement continues today almost as it did in slavery times. The following selections are given partly to illustrate the range of twentieth-century opinion but more particularly to develop certain factors that need to be considered. The first of these suggests that the legal status of the slave had a vital importance in making the institution evil; the second argues that the legal status had very little to do, for better or worse, with the actual condition of Negroes whose conditions of life were determined by their role as unskilled workers on plantation units producing staple crops. The third points out that there were really two kinds of slavery rather than one.

1. *Effects of the Legal Status of Slavery* as interpreted by Professor Dwight L. Dumond of the University of Michigan.¹⁶

In support of their charge that these violations of the standards of contemporary civilization were far more prevalent than Southerners were willing to admit, were inherent in slavery, and were indicative of the general moral tone of the institution, abolitionists presented a line of argument which was not easily contradicted. Slaves were property. They were bought and sold. The purchase price alone determined who might be a slaveholder. Society set no standards of intelligence, character, or integrity for slaveholding. There were no public or private agencies charged with responsibility for the slave's welfare. Human nature being what it is or, better still, what it then was, what security was there for the individual slave against abuse of arbitrary power? Said Weld: "Arbitrary power is to the mind what alcohol is to the body; it intoxicates. It is perhaps the strongest human passion; and the more absolute the power, the stronger the desire for it; and the more it is desired, the more its exercise is enjoyed. . . . The fact that a person intensely desires power over others, *without restraint*, shows the absolute necessity of restraint." This condition was greatly aggravated by the fact that slaves were subject not only to the will of their owner, but to the authority of every white person with whom they came in contact off the owner's property, and to the slightest whim of the owner's family, even of children too immature to have disciplined themselves; and by the further fact that, in spite of abject servility and personal desire to suppress emotions, evidences of resentment must have been a common occurrence. "The idea of *property* having a will," said Weld, "and that too in opposition to the will of its *owner*, and counteracting it, is a stimulant of terrible power to the most relentless human passions." In support of his logic

he brought together in *American Slavery As It Is* what he chose to call the "testimony of a thousand witnesses," the most devastating arraignment of slavery ever published. Hundreds of thousands of copies of the pamphlet were distributed, and its influence was incalculable. There was no effective reply to it, nor could there have been.

Not only did abolitionists examine slavery in the light of the Scriptures and of the moral standards prevailing in contemporary civilization; they also pronounced it contrary to the fundamental principles of the American way of life because it plundered the slaves of their inalienable rights as men: ownership of their own bodies; freedom of choice as to use of time and to occupation; the rights of marriage, family life, and paternal authority; the right to worship according to conscience; the right to cultivate their minds, utilize their peculiar talents and influence their fellow men; the right to protect themselves, their homes, and their families against violence; the right to the protection of the law. These were things which, especially in those days of rugged individualism, made a powerful impression upon the average American.

The lack of legal protection for the slave constituted the greatest single indictment against the slaveholding states. The slave owner had no restraint but his own will over the type and amount of labor assigned to the slave. He might hire him out to other men; he might permit him to labor on his own account and claim his wages; he might inflict any kind or degree of punishment without fear of redress; he might assign absolute authority over the slave to any agent. He might sell the slave at will. The slave was both a chattel and real estate and liable to be sold in satisfaction of debts. He could not testify in court in any case involving a white man. If he raised his hand against a white man in any circumstances whatsoever, the penalty was death. He had no recourse against intolerable conditions but perilous flight.

He could own no property, make no contracts, receive no education, claim no religious instruction. Whatever legislation had been passed with respect to slaves was purely for protection of property rights and the security of the institution. One may find, only rarely, feeble recognition of legislatures and courts of slaves as human beings. This was slavery's most vulnerable spot and was so considered by the abolitionists.

2. *Effects of the Legal Status of Slavery* as interpreted by Professor Avery Craven of the University of Chicago.¹⁷

What owning and being owned added to the usual relationship between employer and employee, it is difficult to say. Rugged individualism seems to have characterized most of those who got ahead in young America and the ability to accumulate property and to employ others was usually ascribed to superior industry and intelligence. Employers, whether in New England factories or in Southern cotton fields, easily fell into attitudes of exploitation and paternalism. Practices varied with individuals rather than with systems. Factory relations differed with each employer, each town, and each decade. Slavery implied uniform practices and attitudes no more than did the factory system. The man with only a few slaves was generally inclined to fraternize with his men and to deal with them much as a Northern farmer dealt with his hired help. The plantation owner, with his larger force and his overseer, was, of necessity, on less intimate terms with his slaves, but his relations with them did not differ essentially from those between factory owner and factory workers. Slave relationships were one thing in the older regions where Negroes and masters had grown up together and quite a different thing in the frontier where slaves had been recently purchased, where the push to get ahead was strong, and where practices had not been standardized. Some masters were naturally kind and careful; some slaves were inherently industrious and docile. Other masters were harsh and indifferent; and other slaves were lazy and provoking. From place to place, from period to period, from person to person, slave-master relationships varied in about the same ways and in about the same degrees as did the employer-labor relations at Lowell or Chicopee or Waltham. Such basic differences as appeared were primarily due to the difference between rural-agricultural effort and urban-industrial effort. Southerners were wont to say that the master, living among his slaves, felt a deeper responsibility for the welfare of his workers than did the factory owner; that paternalism and the spirit of *noblesse oblige* were stronger. Yet many manufacturers provided dormitories for their girls and regulated hours

for retirement, kinds of amusements, and even places of worship for them. Northerners asserted that the slave-master grew haughty and overbearing and that the tendency to exploit was untempered by the slave's ability to quit and find a new job. Yet black lists and agreements between capitalists not to employ one another's workers even when they were laid off temporarily, gave them nearly equal control. In fact, it may be said with much truth that some factory owners manifested all the attitudes of ownership toward their workers and that some masters of slaves manifested few of them. The opposite might be asserted with equal truth. . . .

For the slave also there were both advantages and disadvantages in his lot, not to be found in other labor systems. Of most importance was the fact that he was relieved of all personal direction and material care. He was a soldier without the brass buttons. Responsibility for his care and well-being and for the direction of his efforts was assumed by his master. The slave had no worries about loss of time or unemployment. Against losses from sickness, injury, and old age, he was secure. Worry about weather, crops, and prices belonged to others. As long as his white folks ate, he too would have his rations. He could be confident that the morrow would take care of itself. Life could be serene and unhurried. The acquisitive drive neither corrupted him nor rushed him about. Fear of losses did not disturb his slumbers.

3. *The Two Types of Slavery* as distinguished by George Fort Milton, biographer of Stephen A. Douglas, and historian of the Civil War.¹⁸

. . . [The] slave system in the South had two phases widely different in character and effect. The first of these may be termed feudal or manorial slavery, and the second commercial slavery.

The first system was built about the great plantation, often hereditary, almost a barony in miniature. The planter's social life struck Sir Charles Lyell, the great geologist, as that of the English country gentleman. He had a comfortable home, with pillared veranda, enclosed garden and spacious shade-trees. There were many clean, whitewashed Negro cabins, each with its little vegetable garden and its rollicking pickaninnies.

Self-interest as well as humanity led the master to deal kindly with his slaves. Harriet Martineau was struck by the patience of the slave-owners with their slaves. "The first law of slavery," said *De Bow's Review*, the great Southern economic journal, "is that of kindness from the master to the slave." Most of the great planters sought overseers who were humane and understanding. It was a part of the daily routine of "Mistis," the planter's wife, to see to the health and welfare of

all the slaves, a duty never-ending and uncomplainingly performed. Expert medical attention was carefully provided; usually the same physician attended the "Big House" and the cabins.

The slaves were not overworked. Planters would not set their bondmen to the most unhealthy types of labor, such as ditching and draining, but would hire white men for this work. Usually the task assigned each slave was easily carried out. Punishment was inflicted chiefly on the lazy or the vicious. If a slave repeatedly ignored a task assigned, or were unduly impudent or malingered, he might be whipped. But it was a matter of common observation that happy slaves worked best and frequently a master would sell a surly or dissatisfied slave, even at a substantial sacrifice.

If punishment was held in one hand, reward was held in the other. Quite often the planter paid a cash premium for a slave's additional performance. On many plantations, labor was cheerfully performed and the Negroes seemed gleeful and contented. The field hands sang to the hoe hands, and these answered in song. There were gifts for all at Christmas and care for all through the year. There was happiness in the cabin and a sense of responsibility in the "Big House" on the hill.

Many such planters looked on slavery as a sort of serfdom under which family life should be encouraged, with marriage, inheritance and opportunity for some measure of education and betterment. The great planters were not so anxious to perpetuate property in man as they were to maintain an ordered society and preserve a way of life.

Those who upheld this feudal slavery did so, with rare exceptions, in sincerity and good faith. They did not dislike the Negro; Henry A. Wise expressed a general feeling in terming them patient, faithful, brave "and more disinterested than the white man." Even so, they believed that the Negro was a child race and slavery was its training school for life. By it ignorant, idle Africans, barbarous and unmoral, were divested of their savage inheritance and gradually given the white man's superior civilization. To Jefferson Davis this feudal type of slave society represented a desirable social system. It was manorial slavery which Calhoun termed "a good—a positive good!"

Such men did not contend that slavery would exist forever; they thought the Negro would eventually be equipped for and would be granted a qualified liberty. On his plantation of Briarfield, Davis sought to minimize external discipline of the Negroes and to build up in the slaves a desire to discipline themselves. If a slave could make money for himself, he was at liberty to do so, merely paying the master the wages of an unskilled laborer.

These men were convinced that the system was

a substantial benefit to the slaves themselves. But when they talked of the benefits of slavery they had in mind a slavery of the manor type. They ignored the Census figures, which revealed a different aspect of the slavery problem. There were, in the United States in 1850, some 347,000 slaveholders. Of this entire number, less than 8000 slaveholders owned more than fifty slaves apiece. Of the greater group, doubtless many thousand were city men who held slaves as house servants. The bulk of the remainder were small farmers. A large segment of these, however, were men on the make, men who saw in slavery not a feudal status of society but the chance to make a fortune through labor exploitation. They did not have manor houses—they envied those to the manor born—and sought similar estates of their own.

The great westward movement from the Seaboard South, a striking feature of the first few decades of the nineteenth century, was largely an index of this determination on the part of the ambitious, the bankrupt, the poor and desperate. They heard of the hundreds of thousands of fallow acres in Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas and Texas, available at figures fantastically low in view of the prevailing demand for cotton. In the new Cotton Kingdom, they visioned a manor, broad acres and social status equal to that of the great planters at home. All these they saw—if only they had courage and willingness to exploit the slave system.

This dichotomy of Southern viewpoint made itself apparent in South Carolina with the turn of the Nineteenth Century. The Federal Constitution's ban on the importation of slaves was to date from 1808, but South Carolina passed a State law prohibiting it immediately. In 1804, however, commercial interests sought to reopen the State's slave trade. South Carolina's greatest planters fought desperately against it, but the movers of the scheme were not thinking about South Carolina but of profits from the labor demand for the great empire opening up in the Southwest. Joseph Alston and other great planters protested in vain, the law was repealed and for four years the State had a frenzied importation of slaves.

This episode throws into bold relief the clash between the feudal and the commercial concepts of the slave system, and slavery's legal status permitted either system: the man who owned the slave could be his lord protector or he could treat him as a mere beast of burden, a tool to till the soil. The laws often interfered with the best intentions; let the most humane of masters die, and his slaves might have to be sold and families separated, for a settlement of the estate. Extraneous considerations were constantly creeping in to prevent the South from probing its own

problem and giving statutory authority to the feudal attitude.

Southern apologists were prone to look away from slavery's other face—as well they might, for an evil face it was. After 1808 the internal slave trade, commercial slavery's most hideous side, had a great increase. It made its way with coffles and slave jails; girls were exposed on auction blocks and occasionally the best-formed among them were purchased for love rather than for

labor. Frequently wives were sold away from husbands and children away from mothers. The "first law of slavery" might be the happiness of the slave, yet planters found it hard to secure good overseers, and a Virginian termed them "the curse of this country, Sir, the worst men in the community." Many slaves had kind and indulgent masters but tens of thousands were ruthlessly exploited, particularly upon the new plantations in the Southwest.

VII

The American Abolitionists

SLAVERY is sin before God.
Individually, or as political communities, men have no more
right to enact Slavery, than they have to enact murder or
blasphemy, or incest or adultery.

JAMES G. BIRNEY, 1835, 1844

CONTENTS

Questions for Study	184
Historical Background	185
Part I: The Religious Setting	187
Part II: The Abolitionists Themselves	193
Part III: Radicalism and the American People	204

QUESTIONS FOR STUDY

1. Generally Protestant revivals seem to have inspired (1) individual excitement, (2) personal piety, and (3) an ascetic attitude toward social life. Show how the revivals of Charles G. Finney illustrate this statement.
2. What aspects of traditional religious beliefs did Charles G. Finney and William E. Channing challenge? Why was the success of their challenge an inspiration to social reform?
3. Both the Abolitionists and the American Colonization Society displayed humanitarian zeal for the Negro, but they differed in their opinion of him and in their proposals for his future status. Discuss.
4. The religion which James G. Birney and Theodore Dwight Weld professed has often been called Romantic Christianity. This designation particularly characterized the reformers' views on life after death and on the prospect of abolishing evil and unhappiness on this earth. Explain.
5. The Abolitionists held that the ownership of slaves was a sinful temptation to which man with his appetites and passions had succumbed even though he possessed the moral strength to avoid it. Why does this fundamental assumption as to the nature of slavery account for (1) the attitude of these reformers toward slaveholders, (2) the method they proposed for ending the institution, and (3) their prediction as to the South's fate if it did not reform.
6. Emerson remarked about New England reformers that they had "a fertility of projects for the salvation of the world." How did Whittier react to this characteristic when it appeared in the Abolitionists?
7. James G. Birney believed that there were two great principles of social life. Which of these did slavery illustrate? Had this principle fared well in history?
8. Inability to witness the spectacle of inflicted pain brought many a nineteenth century American to the support of humanitarian causes. How did Theodore Dwight Weld utilize this psychological fact when he wrote *American Slavery As It Is*?
9. In what areas of the United States was sentiment likely to be hostile to the Abolitionists? Where favorable? Explain.
10. To what events could the Abolitionists point as justifying their contention that they were also fighting for the liberties of whites?
11. What was Simeon Salisbury's dilemma when he sought, in the interest of the Negro, to visualize a course of action which would terminate the evils of slavery yet avoid the dangers of immediate abolition?
12. Webster was inclined to blame the Abolitionists for the increased restrictions upon the slave population of the South. But was there not another factor inherent in the relations between the two races which caused the southern white to keep a closer watch over the black?
13. What misgivings did Charles G. Finney have about the Abolitionist program?
14. Whose evaluation of the Abolitionists is preferable, Dumond's or Randall's? Use the Problem materials in giving an answer.

Previous discussion has indicated how slavery prospered below the Mason and Dixon Line during the nineteenth century, while to the north the institution was gradually disappearing. These contrasting developments meant that the practice of treating human beings as chattels had become sectional, stamping a geographical area with a unique point of view regarding race relations. In no other area of human activity did the South so fully comply with Josiah Royce's description of a section as "socially sufficiently unified to have a true consciousness of its own ideals and customs and to possess a sense of its distinction from other parts of the country."

Concurrently with this southern development the winds of historical change were carrying through the land ideas and institutional arrangements far removed in spirit from the opinion which was buttressing slavery. This astonishing manifestation of complaint and reform which appeared after 1825 has been called by one author "Freedom's Ferment,"¹ and the term aptly describes that part of the movement which sought to bring Christian dignity and moral worth to all Americans by the eradication of human suffering and by the perfection of human institutions. With these objectives in mind, reformers submitted every usage of the day to tireless scrutiny. The beginnings of urban America had introduced acute poverty, causing Theodore Parker, a Unitarian preacher, to demand social improvement for the adult poor and vagrant children, his "perishing classes in Boston." Excessive use of alcohol, followed so often by delinquency or dependency, created a galling situation for the critics of society. Temperance societies were founded, and demands for outright prohibition culminated in the Maine Act of 1846. Other states also legislated against the liquor traffic. The condition of the insane, who had long been treated with either brutality or indifference, aroused the crusading fervor of Dorothea Dix. Her well-known memorial to the Massachusetts legislature in 1843, calling to general attention the chained, ragged, and beaten insane of public institutions, signaled the beginning of this frail woman's passage through many states, urging new or improved asylums for the mentally ill. Fighters for other such unfortunate groups as the blind and the imprisoned were not lacking. Because war took equal rank with poverty as a major evil of the human race, Elihu Burritt and William Ladd, New Englanders both, became leaders of a vigorous peace effort which reached even the international scene by 1851. Women were an exploited group of the nineteenth century, condemned in marriage to an inferior position and also finding many avenues of the work-a-day world closed to them. The quarter century after 1825 witnessed passionate assertions of the principle of female equality, and at the Seneca Falls Convention of 1848, a high point in the early agitation, Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton announced to the world a Declaration of Rights, paraphrasing the famous Declaration of 1776. Within a decade states were heeding the feminist voices and removing many of the discriminatory laws. By far the greater part of all these actions took place in New England, the Middle Atlantic states, and the Ohio valley. Reform, like slavery, tended to be sectional.

Historians have shown great curiosity about the causes of this renaissance. If the attempts to explain so complex and intangible an event as a cultural awakening have not been entirely satisfactory, at least some of the conditioning factors have been pointed out. The growing city, of commercial or industrial origin, presented the sharp contrast of wealth and poverty, shocking many a citizen of agrarian America. New technology, whether in transportation or manufacture, set many a mind to questioning the new phenomena or the old order which was being replaced. The shouting in Jacksonian times for political equality inspired the de-

mand for improved education to train the common man in his new responsibilities. Horace Mann and Henry Barnard, secretaries of state boards of education in Massachusetts and Connecticut after 1835, will forever be associated with this common school revival. As a country of loose political controls and uninhabited land to the west, the United States drew visionary Europeans. The English utopian socialism of Robert Owen's New Harmony, the Fourierist phalanx of the Frenchman Cabet—these represented forces of European history given a chance to express themselves on the American scene. Americans of this time had as a legacy from Revolutionary days the Declaration of Independence and found in that document inspiration to protest human inequality and oppression. Furthermore, they were churchgoing and therefore sensitive to those waves of religious feeling which have ebbed and flowed all through the time span of Western civilization. These revivals, by working a change in the hearts and minds of the listening individuals, spurred them to an attempted conversion of society. The Abolitionists were an excellent example of a reform band which arose from religious sources.

The antislavery program came gradually to overshadow all other demands for human betterment and after 1850 monopolized most of the energies of reform. In past ages religious elements with some of the characteristics of the Abolitionists had risen to influence. Prominent among these were the early Christians, some medieval sects, European Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, and Fifth-Monarchy men of England in the seventeenth century. Unfortunately mankind had rarely learned to deal skillfully with them. Expressive of strong forces of discontent, these religious groups often convulsed the society of their origin. Rather than follow a policy of assimilation, the culture usually preferred to annihilate these radicals. The beliefs of the Abolitionists might conceivably rend American society. Working in that very sensitive area of human contact, race relations, they sought to nullify arrangements to which the dominant race was deeply committed. The existing customs they regarded as a violation of divine law and therefore subject to immediate abolition. In the beginning the Abolitionists, like their reforming colleagues, worked successfully in one section, the North, but they eventually came to demand that the entire nation accept their views. Racial equality was a strange element for a union which heretofore had extended constitutional recognition to the opposite principle, slavery. The union of the nineteenth century was a delicate balance of divided loyalties and the American people faced a sore trial in determining the relation of antislavery principles to the existing social, economic, and political structure.

Part I.

THE RELIGIOUS SETTING

In seeking to explain the continued momentum of Western civilization, which so far has neither stagnated nor collapsed like so many of its predecessors, historians have regarded Christianity as one of the vital factors. This religion demanded of its followers the loftiest conceivable standards of conduct. Few, of course, ever reached the pinnacle of human endeavor, but the ideal was there to serve as a noble contrast to the ugliness of actual life. This situation created tension in many a Western mind, impelling individuals to attempt the uniting of the real and the ideal. In the course of their intensive action they changed numerous ideas and institutions of European history. Christianity offered a wide range of ideals which could become the object of human striving. Social and economic conditions of different ages usually determined which values received emphasis from the religious reformers. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries such people tended to be humanitarians—that is, they supported those teachings of Jesus which advocated love and kindness to all beings and expressed a dislike for human suffering.

The new world had not escaped these currents of European history. People of strong religious motivation settled New England, and their descendants moved on to western New York and the Ohio valley. These religious ties fostered the humanitarian spirit when it came to infuse Western civilization. Furthermore we have already seen that there was much to be reformed in the United States of the nineteenth century. It is not surprising, then, that persons of a spiritual inspiration crowded the reform causes. Since one of these and the object of our study, antislavery, had strong religious overtones, it becomes important to observe more closely the relation of religion to reform. This is the purpose of the following selections.

A.

REVIVALS—WORLD-WIDE AND AMERICAN

Many leaders of Protestantism, the dominant form of Christian religion in America of the nineteenth century, were sadly aware that mankind could not be held constantly to the high level of perfection which they preached. Some welcomed, then, any periodic approaches to the ideal by people who most of the time remained more or less routine churchgoers. These occasions were called revivals, and only then were human beings brought to the ultimate Christian attitude. In nineteenth-century Protestantism they became almost customary. For example, many colleges expected their students to partake in a revival at least once during the four-year course.

1. *Revivalism*. The following excerpt from the *Encyclopædia of the Social Sciences* discusses the origins and nature of religious revivals and suggests some parallels between those of nineteenth-century America and other regions at other times.²

In its broadest sense the term religious revival includes all religious practises involving mass enthusiasm or group excitement. Mass excitement, ranging from collective dread or joy to hysteria, is one of the most primitive and pervasive aspects of religion. Typical forms are found in the corroboree rites of the Australians, the shamanistic performances of the Siberian tribes, the Peyote cult of the Winnebago Indians, extreme forms

of *bhakti* in modern Hinduism or of Shinran Buddhism in Japan, the frenzy of the maenads in the Dionysiac mysteries and Chassidism among the Jews. To these random examples from various religions might be added a few illustrations from the history of Christianity: the first Pentecost, the crusades, occasional outbursts at the shrines of healing saints and regular demonstrations at seasonal celebrations, such as the exuberance of a Russian Easter or the pilgrimages of Holy Year.

In a second and more restricted sense the designation is applied, particularly by Christian theologians, to periodic awakenings of religion over large areas and in connection with more general social movements. According to certain schools of theology religion naturally obeys a periodic law.

stagnation and decline being followed by more or less sudden and unforeseen waves of "spiritual awakening"; but it is evident that social processes and transformations throw more light on these revivals than the mere formulation of a periodic law. Of many such waves in the history of Christianity only a few of the most significant may be singled out. The activities of the mediaeval friars, especially the Franciscans, began a revival and led to such reform movements as those of Wycliffe and Savonarola. In general they were occasioned by the growth of town life and the concomitant decline or corruption of the feudal aspects of ecclesiasticism. Later the growth of nationalism sometimes took the form of religious revivals, as in Bohemia in the fifteenth century, Scotland in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Norway and Denmark in the eighteenth and nineteenth. The social and economic upheavals of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were especially fruitful in stimulating revivals, notably in the case of the Quakers and Anabaptists, whose prophetic warnings and extreme observances were protests against growing poverty and oppression, and of the Pietists, who attempted to reform society by cultivating personal piety, engaging in elaborate devotional exercises and promoting missions and other philanthropic enterprises. The Oxford Movement and the recent Catholic "renewal" are spoken of as revivals in this sense.

In its third, and most technical and distinctive, sense the term signifies the phenomena and methods of modern evangelism (*r  veil*, *Erweckung*), directed as a rule to the founding of evangelistic churches or societies. The characteristic features of such evangelism are itinerant preaching and camp meetings; extreme emotional appeals and religious demagoguery; public confession, conversion and more or less permanent reform of personal conduct; fixed seasons for revival meetings when whole congregations or communities are organized for a period of intense emotional stimulation and of concerted appeals to the "unregenerate."

The rapid spread of this type of revivalism in the modern period has been forwarded in large part by the fact that religious forms of excitement and enthusiasm in which even the humblest and most abject could participate effectively offered a convenient form of relief for the growing monotony and misery of the proletarian classes. A second factor in the spread of modern revivalism has been the wide prevalence of frontier conditions, the hardships and isolation of which demand simple forms of entertainment, popular worship and imaginative escape to larger issues and wider communities. Another factor has been the exploitation by skilled leaders of adolescents, of the uneducated, of "primitive" peoples or of other groups

readily subject to emotional disturbances. . . . In general the decline of revivals may be explained not so much by the disappearance of conditions promoting them as by the appearance of secular forms of diversion and secular movements of revolt and collective action.

In the history of American revivals three types may be distinguished. Local outbursts may be caused by unconventional preaching or by social crises or by both, as, for example, the revivals of 1734-40 centering about the preaching of Jonathan Edwards and the popular belief that the Spirit of Grace was being poured out and was working regeneration by supernatural and drastic means in the face of ecclesiastical decline. The financial panics of 1837 and 1857 were accompanied by similar revivals in many of the larger cities. The southern armies during the Civil War underwent numerous revivals, although as a general rule war time is not favorable to revivalism.

A second type centers about the activities of itinerant evangelists. The first movement of this kind was the Great Awakening, beginning in 1740 with the preaching of George Whitefield in New England and spreading over the whole Atlantic seaboard in the following decades. In addition to Whitefield and the Methodist pioneer itinerants, the outstanding preachers of this movement were Gilbert Tennent and James Davenport, whose highly emotional appeals marked a new epoch in homiletic oratory. After the American Revolution there was a revival of religion in the colleges, students being swayed from the prevailing rationalism by the preaching of Timothy Dwight, Lyman Beecher and other educational leaders. In 1800, under the influence chiefly of James McGready, the Kentucky revival began, centering in Logan county, which was notoriously peopled by reprobates, and spreading over a large area, chiefly among the Scotch-Irish settlers. It was characterized by many so-called physical symptoms of supernatural grace, the "jerks," "singing ecstasy" and the like. Other revivals were led by Lorenzo Dow, a Methodist itinerant, by Asahel Nettleton among the northern Congregationalists and by Charles G. Finney in central New York. The last named evangelist is of especial significance because he used less emotional appeals and was successful in converting mature men. A lawyer with almost hypnotic power, he appealed by argument to legal minds and his famous Rochester revival of 1842 was noteworthy for its lasting effects on the adult population. The greatest of all the evangelists, however, was Dwight L. Moody, whose campaigns in the United States, Great Britain and Ireland between 1857 and 1899 not only influenced millions but also raised revivalistic methods to a somewhat higher plane. Perhaps

equal in power to his oratory were the hymns and singing of his partner, Ira D. Sankey. . . .

The third type of revivalism is promoted not merely by itinerant individuals but by organized churches, sects or other religious bodies. About the middle of the nineteenth century the evangelical churches began to lay less stress on revivalistic methods.

2. *Charles G. Finney.* One of the outstanding practitioners of revivalism as a means of promoting religion was Charles G. Finney, a Presbyterian minister. In the middle and eastern states between 1824 and 1842 he conducted a series of triumphant revivals. One of these, at Oneida, New York, was described by another Presbyterian divine, Lyman Beecher; his account illustrates some of the general features of revivals mentioned in the first selection.³

The year of Dr. Beecher's removal to Boston (1826) was signalized by powerful revivals in different parts of the land. Among these, none was more remarkable than those in central New York, particularly within the bounds of the Presbytery of Oneida. From week to week the columns of the Boston Recorder and other religious journals contained glowing accounts of the wonderful outpourings of the Holy Spirit.

Whole towns, in some instances, were said to be converted. In other cases, all the professional and leading men were gathered in. The mightiest opposers and unbelievers were in some places changed to friends, or stirred up to wrath. "It does seem," says one (Feb. 21), "that there never was a time like the present since Pentecost—such wonderful displays of divine grace, such multitudes flocking to Christ."

The Presbytery of Oneida speak of it as "a work of divine power, of which we have witnessed no parallel in this country, and such as we have seldom discovered in the history of the Church."

"In these revivals," they say, "we have discovered no instance of the use of artifice to excite mere human feeling or to influence the passions. In most cases convictions were very pungent and deep. These were the effects of the simple word of God, the sword of the Spirit piercing the conscience and the heart. The word has generally been presented in plain and pointed language. Boisterous speaking and loud declamation have been studiously avoided. Private visiting, faithful discipline, and setting apart days of fasting and prayer, have been eminently blessed. The effectual, fervent, agonizing prayer of faith has been found the immediate forerunner of the operation of divine power."

The Synod of Albany say that, "in consequence of this display of divine power, the theatre has

been deserted, the tavern sanctified; blasphemy has been silenced, and infidelity confounded." Twenty-five congregations had shared in the work. Not a town in Oneida county had been passed by. Not less than twenty-five hundred were subjects of hopeful conversion.

3. *A Finney Conversion.* The psychological reaction of a person exposed to a Finney revival is described in Finney's own account of Theodore Dwight Weld's conversion. Weld, later to be an important figure in the anti-slavery cause, was attending Hamilton College when Finney came to preach in nearby Utica. Weld had been reported as expressing disapproval of Finney, but was tricked into hearing one of the revivalist's sermons.⁴

After the introductory exercises, I arose and named this text: "One sinner destroyeth much good." I had never preached from it, or heard it preached from; but it came home with great power to my mind, and this fact decided the selection of the text. I began to preach, and to show in a great many instances, how one sinner might destroy much good, and how the influence of one man might destroy a great many souls. I suppose that I drew a pretty vivid picture of Weld, and of what his influence was, and what mischief he might do. Once or twice he made an effort to get out; but his aunt perceiving it, would throw herself forward, and lean on the slip in front, and engage in silent prayer, and he could not get out without arousing and annoying her; and therefore he remained in his seat till meeting was out.

The next day I called at a store in Genesee street, to converse with some people there, as it was my custom to go from place to place for conversation; and whom should I find there but Weld? He fell upon me very unceremoniously, and I should think, for nearly or quite an hour, talked to me in a most abusive manner. I had never heard anything like it. I got an opportunity to say but very little to him myself, for his tongue ran incessantly. He was very gifted in language. It soon attracted the attention of all that were in the store, and the news ran along the streets, and the clerks gathered in from the neighboring stores, and stood to hear what he had to say. All business ceased in the store, and all gave themselves up to listening to his vituperation. But finally I appealed to him and said, "Mr. Weld, are you the son of a minister of Christ, and is this the way for you to behave?" I said a few words in that direction, and I saw that it stung him; and throwing out something very severe, he immediately left the store.

I went out also, and returned to Mr. Aiken's,

where for the time I was lodging. I had been there but a few moments when somebody called at the door, and as no servant was at hand I went to the door myself. And who should come in but Mr. Weld? He looked as if he would sink. He began immediately to make the most humble confession and apology for the manner in which he had treated me; and expressed himself in the strongest terms of self-condemnation. I took him kindly by the hand and had a little conversation with him, assured him that I had laid up nothing against him, and exhorted him earnestly, to give his heart to God. I believe I prayed with him before he went. He left, and I heard no more of him that day.

That evening I preached, I think, at New Hartford, and returned late in the evening. The next morning I heard that he went to his aunt's, greatly impressed and subdued. She asked him to pray in the family. He said that he was at first shocked at the idea. But his enmity arose so much, that he thought that that was one way in which he had not yet expressed his opposition, and therefore he would comply with her request. He knelt down, and began and went on with what his aunt intended should be a prayer; but from his own account of it, it was the most blasphemous strain of vituperation that could well be uttered. He kept on in a most wonderful way, until they all became convulsed with feeling and astonishment; and he

kept on so long, that the light went out before he closed. His aunt attempted to converse with him, and to pray with him; but the opposition of his heart was terrible. She became frightened at the state of mind which he manifested. After praying with him, and entreating him to give his heart to God, she retired.

He went to his room; and walked his room by turns, and by turns he lay upon the floor. He continued the whole night in that terrible state of mind, angry, rebellious, and yet so convicted that he could scarcely live. Just at daylight, while walking back and forth in his room, he said, a pressure came upon him that crushed him down to the floor; and with it came a voice that seemed to command him to repent, to repent now. He said it broke him down to the floor, and there he lay, until, late in the morning, his aunt coming up, found him upon the floor calling himself a thousand fools; and to all human appearance, with his heart all broken to pieces.

The next night he rose in meeting, and asked if he might make confession. I answered, yes; and he made public confession before the whole congregation. He said it became him to remove the stumbling-block which he had cast before the whole people; and he wanted opportunity to make the most public confession he could. He did make a very humble, earnest, broken-hearted confession.

B.

THE RELIGIOUS PATH TO REFORM

Protestant Christianity had other ministers like Finney, although not so distinguished. That they inspired their audiences with a zeal to change the world was unquestionable. Some of the converts became active in missionary, Bible, or Sabbath school societies; others joined antislavery, peace, temperance, or moral-reform groups. But Finney's kind of revivalism was not the only religious awakening which became a prelude to such action. Attention might equally be given to that breakdown of long-standing Puritan beliefs, which was known in its early stages as Unitarianism. It had implications for the social conscience of New England, and from the beginning Unitarians, led by William Ellery Channing, were prominent in social reform.

It is proper, then, to ask why there should have been this progression from religion through revival to reform. After all, the Christian churches had accepted all sorts of injustices and inequalities as frequently as they had challenged them. When Puritanism, mother religion for many of the reformers, was given free rein in New England, it vigorously maintained a uniformity of spiritual belief and tended to look upon any deviation as threatening to introduce the extreme views of left-wing sects which were countenanced by English Puritanism at the time of Cromwell and the Civil War. Even in the eighteenth century when revival stirred the New England religion, the quest was confined to personal salvation. Plainly the older orthodoxy had somehow to be transformed before it could become a source of nineteenth-century reform.

1. *Finney and the Old Orthodoxy.* No doubt the explanation lies deep in the intellectual history of Western civilization. Here only a suggestion can be offered—a twentieth-

century historian's explanation of how Charles G. Finney proposed to change the doctrines of Calvin, heart of American Congregational and Presbyterian beliefs, so that religion

would inspire his listeners to reconstruct American society.⁵

What made Finney an epochal figure was not his eloquence or his "new measures,"* it was the new doctrine that he preached. He was far keener and bolder than Beecher, and the orthodox clergy of the West and South rightly saw in Finney the heresiarch of Calvinism, the first preacher "who adequately attempted to employ the theology of New Haven † in its practical relations." Thanks to his freedom from theological training, Finney felt no restraining obligation to reconcile the new spirit moving in the churches with the old Calvinism. His attacks were not oblique but frontal. To him original sin was not "some constitutional depravity which lies back and is the cause of actual transgressions": it was simply "a deep-seated but voluntary . . . self-interest . . . All sin consists in selfishness; and all holiness or virtue, in disinterested benevolence."

Going far beyond any orthodox creed of his time, Finney tore away the mystical terrors that veiled the workings of the Holy Ghost in human hearts during conversion. "It is not a miracle or dependent on a miracle in any sense," he declared. "It is purely a philosophical result of the right use of constituted means." What is more, "a revival of religion is not a miracle . . . it consists entirely in the right exercise of the powers of nature." These powers Finney admitted to be merely those arising from emotional "excitement"; but they were not to be deplored on that account. "Mankind will not act until they are excited . . . How many there are who know they ought to be religious, but they . . . are procrastinating repentance until they . . . have secured some favorite worldly interest. Such persons never will . . . relinquish their ambitious schemes till they are so excited that they cannot contain themselves any longer." Thus, Finney concluded, it was the sinner himself who accomplished his conversion. Indeed, "if the sinner ever has a new heart, he must . . . make it himself," not through some obscure miracle of the Holy Ghost, but by "changing the controlling preference of the mind." Instead of a "preference for self-interest," he must exercise a "preference for disinterested benevolence."

This break with orthodoxy changed for Finney's converts the whole emphasis of religious experience. Calvinism had made salvation the

end of all human desire and fear of hell the spur to belief; whereas Finney made salvation the beginning of religious experience instead of its end. The emotional impulse which Calvinism had concentrated upon a painful quest for a safe escape from life, Finney thus turned toward benevolent activity. Converts, he declared, did not escape life: they began a new life "in the interests of God's Kingdom." In this new life "they have no separate interests . . . They should set out with a determination to aim at *being useful in the highest degree possible*."

Among Finney's converts this gospel released a mighty impulse toward social reform. A contemporary remarked acutely that the new doctrine had made over Calvinism into "a very practical affair, and adapted it well to American tastes and habits. It encourages mankind to *work* as well as to *believe*. Let loose from the chains of predestination, and in accordance with this new light, the scheme has been set on foot in America, of converting the world *at once* . . . a very natural excess of such emancipation of the mind, and of the overflowings of benevolence."

2. *William Ellery Channing*. As orthodox Calvinism began to lose its hold on New England, Unitarianism won many adherents away from the Calvinist fold. One of the leaders of Unitarianism was William Ellery Channing who, like others of the new faith, rejected Calvinistic doctrines of the absolute sovereignty of God and the complete depravity of man. His own explanations show that his concepts of God and man led him naturally to the position of social critic and potential reformer.⁶

Let me, then, set it before you, in new terms, and by a new illustration; and if, in so doing, I may wound the feelings of some who hear me, I beg them to believe, that I do it with pain, and from no impulse but a desire to serve the cause of truth.—Suppose, then, that a teacher should come among you, and should tell you, that the Creator, in order to pardon his own children, had erected a gallows in the centre of the universe, and had publicly executed upon it, in room of the offenders, an Infinite Being, the partaker of his own Supreme Divinity; suppose him to declare, that this execution was appointed, as a most conspicuous and terrible manifestation of God's justice, and of the infinite woe denounced by his law; and suppose him to add, that all beings in heaven and earth are required to fix their eyes on this fearful sight, as the most powerful enforcement of obedience and virtue. Would you not tell him, that he calumniated his Maker? Would you not say to him, that this central gallows threw gloom over the universe; that the

* Finney permitted women to pray in public meetings, held meetings which lasted sometimes for weeks, and used as helpers some of his new converts.

† A New Haven divine, Nathaniel Taylor, had argued, contrary to orthodox views, that infants were born sinless and that they could not sin until old enough to be held accountable.

spirit of a government, whose very acts of pardon were written in such blood, was terror, not paternal love; and that the obedience which needed to be upheld by this horrid spectacle, was nothing worth? Would you not say to him, that even you, in this infancy and imperfection of your being, were capable of being wrought upon by nobler motives, and of hating sin through more generous views; and that much more the angels, those pure flames of love, need not the gallows and an executed God to confirm their loyalty? You would all so feel, at such teachings as I have supposed; and yet how does this differ from the popular doctrine of atonement? . . .

An enlightened, disinterested human being, morally strong, and exerting a wide influence by the power of virtue, is the clearest reflexion of the divine splendor on earth . . . The glory of the Maker lies in his work . . . Those men glorify God most, who look with keen eye and loving heart on his works, who catch in all some glimpses of beauty and power, who have a spiritual sense for good in its dimmest manifestations, and who can so interpret the world, that it becomes a bright witness to the divinity. . . .

I have also felt and continually insisted, that a new reverence for man was essential to the cause of social reform. . . . There can be no spirit of brotherhood, no true peace, any farther than men come to understand their affinity with and relation to God and the infinite purpose for which he gave them life. As yet these ideas are treated as a kind of spiritual romance; . . . The reception of this plainest truth of Christianity would revolutionize society, and create relations among men not dreamed of at the present day. . . . Men would know the import of the word Brother, as yet nothing but a word to multitudes. None of us can conceive the change of manners, the new courtesy and sweetness, the mutual kindness, deference, and sympathy, the life and energy of efforts for social melioration, which are to spring up, in proportion as man shall penetrate beneath the body to the spirit, and shall learn what the lowest human being is. . . .

It is because I have learned the essential equality of men before the common Father, that I cannot endure to see one man establishing his arbitrary will over another by fraud, or force, or wealth, or rank, or superstitious claims. It is because the human being has moral powers, because he carries a law in his own breast, and was made to govern himself, that I cannot endure to see him taken out of his own hands and fashioned into a tool by another's avarice or pride. It is because I see in him a great nature, the divine image, and vast capacities, that I demand for him means of self-development, spheres for free action; that I call society not to fetter, but to aid his growth.

3. Emerson's Description of the Reformers.

Once the spirit began to work, New England reform went far. Ralph Waldo Emerson, Concord philosopher, describes the reforming zeal at its apogee. Emerson emphasizes that each person had his own plan for the reformation of society.⁷

Whoever has had opportunity of acquaintance with society in New England, during the last twenty-five years, with those middle and with those leading sections that may constitute any just representation of the character and aim of the community, will have been struck with the great activity of thought and experimenting. His attention must be commanded by the signs that the Church, or religious party, is falling from the church nominal, and is appearing in temperance and non-resistance societies, in movements of abolitionists and of socialists, and in very significant assemblies, called Sabbath and Bible Conventions,—composed of ultraists, of seekers, of all the soul of the soldiery of dissent, and meeting to call in question the authority of the Sabbath, of the priesthood, and of the church. In these movements, nothing was more remarkable than the discontent they begot in the movers. The spirit of protest and of detachment, drove the members of these Conventions to bear testimony against the church, and immediately afterward, to declare their discontent with these Conventions, their independence of their colleagues, and their impatience of the methods whereby they were working. They defied each other, like a congress of kings, each of whom had a realm to rule, and a way of his own that made concert unprofitable. What a fertility of projects for the salvation of the world! One apostle thought that all men should go to farming; and another, that no man should buy or sell: that the use of money was the cardinal evil; another, that the mischief was in our diet, that we eat and drink damnation. These made unleavened bread, and were foes to the death of fermentation. It was in vain urged by the housewife, that God made yeast, as well as dough, and loves fermentation just as dearly as he loves vegetation; that fermentation develops the saccharine element in the grain, and makes it more palatable and more digestible. No; they wish the pure wheat, and will die but it shall not ferment. Stop, dear nature, these incessant advances of thine; let us scotch these ever-rolling wheels! Others attacked the system of agriculture, the use of animal manures in farming; and the tyranny of man over brute nature; these abuses polluted his food. The ox must be taken from the plough, and the horse from the cart, the hundred acres of the farm must be spaded, and the man must walk wherever boats and locomotives will not carry him. Even the insect world was to be

defended,—that had been too long neglected, and a society for the protection of ground-worms, slugs, and mosquitos was to be incorporated without delay. With these appeared the adepts of homoeopathy, of hydropathy, of mesmerism, of phrenology, and their wonderful theories of the Christian miracles! Others assailed particular vocations, as that of the lawyer, that of the merchant, of the manufacturer, of the clergyman, of the scholar. Others attacked the institution of marriage, as the fountain of social evils. Others devoted them-

selves to the worrying of churches and meetings for public worship; and the fertile forms of antinomianism among the elder puritans, seemed to have their match in the plenty of the new harvest of reform.

With this din of opinion and debate, there was a keener scrutiny of institutions and domestic life than any we had known, there was sincere protesting against existing evils, and there were changes of employment dictated by conscience.

Part II.

THE ABOLITIONISTS THEMSELVES

In the seventeenth century Quakers expressed an earnest disapproval of slavery, but their influence scarcely extended beyond the members of the sect. The idealism of the Revolutionary period gave an impetus to abolition in those states where slaves had been found useless and therefore scarce. Although not at the time a recognized state, Vermont forbade slavery in her constitution of 1777. In 1783 the Massachusetts courts construed the state constitution as forbidding slavery. New Hampshire's fundamental law of 1784 followed the lead of Vermont. While these constitutional changes were in progress, Pennsylvania (1780), Connecticut and Rhode Island (1784), New York (1799), and New Jersey (1804) passed legislative acts abolishing the institution. In New Jersey the gradual nature of the emancipation allowed a remnant of slaves as late as 1846. Although south of the Mason and Dixon Line no such development took place, the Revolutionary leaders of Virginia were as strong in their dislike of slavery as northerners; Washington freed his slaves by his last will; Jefferson, Madison, and Henry all sincerely wished that the country were rid of the practice.

A.

RIVALRY FOR ANTISLAVERY LEADERSHIP

After 1815, and indeed until the eve of emancipation, those who wished slavery removed from the American scene usually took one of two positions: either they were for destroying the institution without further ado, or they would gradually transfer the Negro to Africa. Everyone is familiar in some degree with the Abolitionists, but the colonization program has suffered the obscurity of a reform that failed.

1. *An Abolitionist Manifesto.* The time usually associated with the beginning of the Abolitionist movement is 1831, when William Lloyd Garrison published the first issue of his *Liberator*. In 1833 he and other militants gathered at a national convention. Among those present were the Tappans, New York silk merchants who subsidized the cause, John Greenleaf Whittier, the poet, a few Quakers from Pennsylvania, and members of a group from upstate New York and Ohio, who had experienced the revivalistic preaching of Charles G. Finney. Actually the "convention" was only a meeting of some sixty individuals, but in an appeal for nation-wide support it issued a declaration which was a good statement of the reformers' principles and pro-

gram. This declaration contains lines which would have a strong appeal for many Americans of the nineteenth century, yet other passages were almost certain to antagonize an equal number.⁸

[Declaration of the National Anti-Slavery Convention]

The Convention, assembled in the City of Philadelphia to organize a National Anti-Slavery Society, promptly seize the opportunity to promulgate the following DECLARATION OF SENTIMENTS, as cherished by them in relation to the enslavement of one-sixth portion of the American people.

More than fifty-seven years have elapsed since

a band of patriots convened in this place, to devise measures for the deliverance of this country from a foreign yoke. The cornerstone upon which they founded the **TEMPLE OF FREEDOM** was broadly this—"that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, **LIBERTY**, and the pursuit of happiness." At the sound of their trumpet-call, three millions of people rose up as from the sleep of death, and rushed to the strife of blood; deeming it more glorious to die instantly as freemen, than desirable to live one hour as slaves. They were few in number—poor in resources; but the honest conviction that **TRUTH**, **JUSTICE** and **RIGHT** were on their side, made them invincible.

We have met together for the achievement of an enterprise, without which, that of our fathers is incomplete, and which, for its magnitude, solemnity, and probable results upon the destiny of the world, as far transcends theirs, as moral truth does physical force. . . .

The right to enjoy liberty is inalienable. To invade it, is to usurp the prerogative of Jehovah. Every man has a right to his own body—to the products of his own labor—to the protection of law—and to the common advantages of society. . . .

Therefore we believe and affirm— . . .

That every American citizen, who retains a human being in involuntary bondage, as his property, is [according to Scripture] a **MAN-STEALER**.

That the slaves ought instantly to be set free, and brought under the protection of law;

That if they had lived from the time of Pharaoh down to the present period, and had been entailed through successive generations, their right to be free could never have been alienated, but their claims would have constantly risen in solemnity;

That all those laws which are now in force, admitting the right of slavery, are therefore before God utterly null and void; being an audacious usurpation of the Divine prerogative, a daring infringement on the law of nature, a base overthrow of the very foundations of the social compact, a complete extinction of all the relations, endearments and obligations of mankind, and a presumptuous transgression of all the holy commandments—and that therefore they ought to be instantly abrogated.

We further believe and affirm—

That all persons of color who possess the qualifications which are demanded of others ought to be admitted forthwith to the enjoyment of the same privileges, and the exercise of the same prerogatives, as others; and that the paths of preferment, of wealth, and of intelligence, should

be opened as widely to them as to persons of a white complexion.

We maintain that no compensation should be given to the planters emancipating their slaves— . . .

We regard, as delusive, cruel and dangerous, any scheme of expatriation which pretends to aid, either directly or indirectly, in the emancipation of the slaves, or to be a substitute for the immediate and total abolition of slavery.

We fully and unanimously recognise the sovereignty of each State, to legislate exclusively on the subject of the slavery which is tolerated within its limits. We concede that Congress, *under the present national compact*, has no right to interfere with any of the slave States, in relation to this momentous subject.

But we maintain that Congress has a right, and is solemnly bound, to suppress the domestic slave trade between the several States, and to abolish slavery in those portions of our territory which the Constitution has placed under its exclusive jurisdiction.

We also maintain that there are, at the present time, the highest obligations resting upon the people of the free States to remove slavery by moral and political action, as prescribed in the Constitution of the United States. They are now living under a pledge of their tremendous physical force to fasten the galling fetters of tyranny upon the limbs of millions in the southern States;—they are liable to be called at any moment to suppress a general insurrection of the slaves;—they authorise the slave owner to vote for three-fifths of his slaves as property, and thus enable him to perpetuate his oppression;—they support a standing army at the south for its protection;—and they seize the slave who has escaped into their territories, and send him back to be tortured by an enraged master or a brutal driver.

This relation to slavery is criminal and full of danger: **IT MUST BE BROKEN UP.**

These are our views and principles—these, our designs and measures. With entire confidence in the overruling justice of God, we plant ourselves upon the Declaration of our Independence, and upon the truths of Divine Revelation, as upon the **EVERLASTING ROCK**.

We shall organize Anti-Slavery Societies, if possible, in every city, town and village in our land.

We shall send forth Agents to lift up the voice of remonstrance, of warning, of entreaty and rebuke.

We shall circulate, unsparingly and extensively, anti-slavery tracts and periodicals.

We shall enlist the **PULPIT** and the **PRESS** in the cause of the suffering and the dumb.

We shall aim at a purification of the churches from all participation in the guilt of slavery.

We shall encourage the labor of freemen over that of the slaves, by giving a preference to their productions;—and

We shall spare no exertions nor means to bring the whole nation to speedy repentance. . . .

Submitting this DECLARATION to the candid examination of the people of this country, and of the friends of liberty all over the world, we hereby affix our signatures to it;—pledging ourselves that, under the guidance and by the help of Almighty God, we will do all that in us lies, consistently with this Declaration of our principles, to overthrow the most execrable system of slavery that has ever been witnessed upon earth—to deliver our land from its deadliest curse—to wipe out the foulest stain which rests upon our national escutcheon—and to secure to the colored population of the United States, all the rights and privileges which belong to them as men and as Americans—come what may to our persons, our interests, or our reputations—whether we live to witness the triumph of JUSTICE, LIBERTY, and HUMANITY, or perish untimely as martyrs in this great, benevolent and holy cause.

2. *The American Colonization Society.* Founded in 1816, the American Colonization Society between 1821 and 1867 transported 6000 free Negroes to Liberia. Resolutions of state legislatures, churches, and local societies testified that Americans were sympathetic to this method of solving the Negro question. Many a political leader felt drawn to the program, Lincoln himself pleading seriously for its trial as late as 1862. The following public appeal by the managers of the society illustrates the striking contrast between its ideas and those of the Abolitionists; here the appeal to conservative opinion, North and South, is very strong.⁹

The practicability of colonizing in Africa, any number of the Free People of Colour of the United States, that may choose to emigrate, being demonstrated; the Managers of the American Colonization Society, address their fellow-citizens, under a deep conviction, that this whole nation is now summoned to aid the work, by the most weighty considerations of interest, duty, and charity. Believing, as the Managers do, that it is a work of immediate and vast importance, on the accomplishment of which, depends the temporal and eternal happiness of millions in this country, and in Africa, and which can be adequately done only by the combined powers of the nation, they are urged irresistably, to make an appeal in its behalf to all the patriotic, humane, and religious of the land. . . . Of the success of the plan, they can now speak not merely with hope, but with confidence.—A Colony of more than two thousand

persons, firmly established, well-ordered and well-governed; prosperous in trade; moral and religious in character; with schools and churches; courts of justice, and a periodical press; enlarging its territory, and growing in strength; respected by all who have visited it from Europe, and exerting a salutary and extensive influence over the native tribes, now offers an asylum for our free coloured population, and to our citizens, every means and motive for conferring freedom on those who enjoy it not, and imparting civilization and christianity to Africa.

Though the Managers regard the scheme of the Society, as essentially connected with the purity and stability of our political institutions, and the glory of our national character, yet it is rather in its benevolent aspect towards a long afflicted and degraded people, in the midst of us, and their more wretched brethren in Africa, that they would commend it to the patronage of the public.—That there are causes operating to retard the improvement and depress the minds of the free people of colour in the United States, which no benevolence nor even Religion, can for ages, if ever remove; and that the elevation, to any great degree, of our coloured population generally, depends upon their settlement as a distinct community, in some country beyond the reach of those embarrassing circumstances, from which, neither humanity nor legislation can relieve them here, the Managers consider decided both by reason and experience. It is not merely with law and prejudice that the free man of colour has here to contend; but with superior knowledge, wealth and influence, with a competition to which he is unequal, with a deep sense of the thralldom of his past, and the disadvantages of his present condition, with an inwrought conviction, that whatever may be the worthy temporal, object of his pursuit, he has little prospect of attaining it, and that neither he nor his brethren can stem the tide, which beats against him in almost every course of life. . . .

But while the Society would confer upon free men of colour unspeakable blessings, it offers the best asylum for slaves manumitted from regard to interest, humanity or conscience. Who does not know that in many States, the right of emancipation has been denied to the master, on the ground, that the exercise of such right would be inconsistent with the public good? Yet the restrictions of law have to a great extent proved ineffectual to prevent manumission, and numerous slaves have been transferred to other States, wherein they might enjoy, at least, nominal freedom, though still untouched by the spirit, and denied the blessings of Genuine Liberty. The Society adhering closely to its original design and principles, and exerting no influence upon slav-

ery, except a moral influence, through the will of the master; gives freedom to that will, relieves it from every embarrassment, and demonstrates to the view of all concerned, how emancipation to any and every extent desired, may be effected, not with danger or detriment, but rather with advantage to the public, and vast and perpetual benefit to the slave. Certain it is, that thousands of our fellow-citizens, whose dearest interests are identified with the prosperity and honour of the South, give their countenance and aid to the Society, not merely because it is most beneficial to the people of colour already free, but as offering powerful inducements to voluntary manumission by individuals, and States. And true it is, that the enemies of the Society are reduced to two classes, those who would abolish slavery instantaneously, and those who desire it may never be abolished. Hundreds are now freemen in Liberia, who were recently slaves in the United States, and many others of the same class are held in trust for the Society whenever its means shall be adequate to their colonization. . . .

The Managers feel that the time has come, when it were criminal on this subject, to be silent. *They feel that something should be done, compared with which all that has been done is nothing.*—They know that a spirit should go abroad throughout all the borders of the land, like that which kindled in the hearts of our fathers, when they staked their all for independence; that every lover of man and of God, is called, as by a mandate from Heaven, to lift up his voice

and bring forward his contribution to effect an object, the doing of which, will in all after ages, be deemed our Nation's chief glory, while Africa will record and celebrate it, as the great moral revolution in her history. . . . The sum saved in a single year to the state of New York, by the partial reformation from intemperance, would transport to Africa the annual increase of the whole coloured population of the U. S. And shall we, the most prosperous people in the world, who are legislating not to increase, but reduce our revenue, want for such an object, a mere pittance of that which is, yearly, by luxury and intemperance worse than wasted? The magnitude of the work and the expense to be incurred in its accomplishment, constitute no valid objections to it, because the importance and glory of it exceed the former, and our means the latter. And that history gives no precedent for such a work, will prove but a miserable apology for neglecting it, unless it be reasonable to make the *standard of our duty and the measure of our renown* correspond to those of *long buried* nations, rather than to the *greatness* of our obligations to God, of our *opportunities* and *means* of usefulness and the *height* of christian *charity*. Surely the people of the United States cannot forget how God hath delivered and exalted them by his own right hand, that the light of their example might bless the world; nor will they sacrifice both duty and renown, for fear of showing to mankind that it is possible for nations as well as individuals to be magnanimous and illustrious for virtue.

B.

THE ABOLITIONIST MIND

Literature by the Abolitionists about themselves is vast, and the selection of typical material is difficult. The words of many individuals, all of whom were important in the reform, might be taken as guides to the inner nature of the movement. William Lloyd Garrison would certainly be one of these. Theodore Dwight Weld another. The latter we have already seen falling in 1825 under the spell of a Finney revival. Thereafter such reforms as temperance, education, and colonization occupied him until he became an Abolitionist in 1833. It is hard to exaggerate Weld's importance. "Eloquent as an angel and powerful as thunder," he made the movement a real force in western New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. His converts turned into enthusiastic local agents or reached national prominence. The Tappans and Harriet Beecher Stowe, James G. Birney, Alabama planter and Presidential candidate, Joshua Giddings, congressional leader of the antislavery forces, the Grimké sisters of South Carolina, one of whom Weld married, Edwin M. Stanton, Lincoln's Secretary of War—all were brought to Abolitionism through Weld. His correspondence provides an excellent insight into the Abolitionist mind and will be emphasized in the following materials.

1. *The Religious Spirit of the Abolitionists.* Religiously speaking the Abolitionists were Fundamentalists—that is, they believed in the Bible as the literal word of God, revealing

the true standards of Christian sentiment and action. Since, however, the Old and New Testaments are embarrassingly rich in their suggestions for the spiritual and good life, we

must turn to letters of the Abolitionists to learn more exactly what their beliefs were. The first selection is a letter from James G. Birney, shortly before he died, in which he looks back upon a busy life of religion and reform. Birney's words are a good summary of the religious mood of the reformers. For them Christianity has become a religion without theology or churches, affirming as a creed the example and moral teachings of Jesus. The second and third letters reveal, as do the quotations at the beginning of this Problem, a religious way of looking at human institutions. Either they were holy or sinful; if the latter then the individuals concerned were personally accountable and blameworthy before God. The last selection, of strong Biblical flavor, indicates what Weld hopes will be the end of all this reform.¹⁰

[James G. Birney to Gerrit Smith,
October 29, 1857]

Many will think especially Sectarians that I will go into the other world with but slender provision for its happiness. If I do not love justice, prudence, mercy, kindness; if I am not patient, long suffering, disposed, whenever I can, to do good to my fellow man; if I do not dispense with a most liberal hand the things God has put into my power partially to bless others and relieve their wants, in fine if I am not *God like* in all my tempers, giving my higher nature mastery over my lower one, if I have used all the power He has given me to pull down his word and not to build it up, then am I poorly prepared to enter on its joys. But I cannot conceive of a great or noble character Truly so, that is not built up with the things I have mentioned and kindred ones. And are we to suppose God will condemn a Character, which makes his son our exemplar, and strives in all things to be like it; Certainly not. O no, dear Gerrit, he intends me and he intends you for even a higher and happier state of existence than you have had here. Judging from what God has done for us heretofore, notwithstanding our peevishness and fretfulness and unfaithfulness shall we at all limit his goodness to us hereafter? Yes, he is God, Gerrit, and there is none like him.

You have known that for a long time, I have lost all confidence in mere beliefs as necessary to happiness hereafter. Whether we believe in the Inspiration of the Bible—in the vicarious atonement—in the personality of the Holy Ghost appears to me a small and deceptive business. The question truly is do we do what good things the Scriptures and Christ and the Holy Ghost tell us to do?

[Calvin Chapin to James G. Birney,
December 18, 1837]

Grant, too, that to man's depraved dislike of labor—to his guilty love of power—to his wicked avarice—and to his licentious appetites and passions, American slavery, which is said to be the worst that is known among nations denominated christian, presents very strong temptations to sinful indulgence. Be it remembered, however, that temptation can never justify iniquity. In no case can it render innocent either the *invasion* or the *withholding* of rights. Every person has strength enough to overcome and defeat temptation. Christ requires every person to *use* that strength, and to become, by it, *victorious*.

Temptations to wickedness appear to be tolerated, in our world, for the purpose of showing what every person's character and choice are—whether, through the love of iniquity, to *comply*—or whether, by the power of moral principle, to *conquer*. The High and Holy One never placed a moral agent in a condition which *compels* him to sin, or renders the *avoidance* of wickedness *impossible*. True emancipation demands that slaveholders begin their reformation by ceasing to sin, in their treatment of their colored neighbors, and proceed, without delay, to do them every kind of good in their power.

[James G. Birney to Lewis Tappan,
February 3, 1835]

I am, more and more convinced, from many of the proceedings at the north, that they are, in the main, ignorant of the Slaveholders *tenacity*, and of the moral obliquities that Slavery has produced in him. Of this I feel confident, that nothing but the most tremendous mental shock—nothing short of the fear of Hell will make him resign his hold. Let me explain by a supposed case: All the Protestant Churches in the free States, say, are anti-slavery, viewing slavery as inconsistent with christianity. A Slaveholding Minister from the South is among you on a visit. You do not invite him to preach in *your* pulpits and you prohibit him from partaking with you the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The reason to be assigned to him calmly and kindly. The same course to be pursued with a lay member. Here, sir, is the kind of *shock* I mean. Where could he go? What could he do? You have "*power (moral power) on your side*"—and he like his poor slave at home "*has no comforter*." I do verily believe that *Union* like this among the Northern Churches would be the strongest lever that could be used, for the peaceable and happy termination of slavery. It would compel men to "*consider their ways*," confess their faults to their brethren, and if they are Christ's to repent and humble themselves before God.

[Theodore Dwight Weld to James G. Birney,
May 28, 1834]

From the information which I am constantly hearing from all parts of the country, I am persuaded that no moral enterprize in this country has ever made such progress beyond expectation, prayer and hope as this most glorious millen[n]ial enterprise. Difficulties there will be, and opposition, and misconstruction of motives, and perhaps and probably temporary alienation of friends, and very likely the sea and the waves roaring, but Oh my brother, what will be the peace and righteousness, and joy in the Holy Ghost, which will permeate the whole when these tempestuo[u]s elements shall have foamed out their fury and a voice Almighty hushes down the wild tumult and spreads over all the image of heaven.

2. "*Wages of Sin.*" If those who held slaves were sinners, then they became subject to God's wrath and perhaps even to the anger and retribution of human beings who were not guilty. If the slaveholders persisted, even after moral suasion and denunciation, then they merited the Biblical fate of a sinful people. This reasoning led many an Abolitionist to words and opinions quite in contrast to the idealism of the previous statements. The first two letters which follow are full of invective against slavery, a common oratorical tool of the Abolitionists. The last two give Weld's reaction to the news of actual or anticipated difficulties in the South. They are very much like those of a Hebrew prophet, for Weld looks upon the troubles of the South as punishment due from a just God, whose words of counsel and warning have been long disregarded. In an earlier mood he was expecting peace and righteousness to spread over the world. Now he seems reconciled to seeing the South, unrepentant of its slavery, go down in ruin.¹¹

[Theodore Dwight Weld to James Hall, about
May 20, 1834]

Men will no longer take opinions on trust and think by proxy upon the subject of slavery. They will no longer admit the validity of the oppressor's claim to a monopoly of sympathy for the oppressed, and a monopoly of capacity to understand the system, and of wisdom, benevolence and conscience to devise the best means to determine the best time when the sin of oppression shall cease. Slavery, with its robbery of body and soul from birth to death, its exactions of toil unrecompensed, its Sunderings of kindred, its frantic orgies of lust, its intellect levelled with the dust, its baptisms of blood, and its legacy of damning horrors to the eternity of the spirit—Slavery, in

this land of liberty, and light, and revivals of millennial glory—its days are numbered and well-nigh finished. Would to God that they were not the daily enacted horrors of living reality—the legitimate fruits of a system authorized by Law, patronized and protected by republican institutions, sanctioned by public sentiment, and sanctified by religion. While these things are so, research, and discussion, and appeal, and remonstrance, and rebuke, and strong beseechings shall never cease. The nation is shaking off its slumbers to sleep no more.

[Theodore Dwight Weld to Lewis Tappan,
November 17, 1835]

The thieves, the man stealers, the whore mongers must be thrus[t out] with headlong haste and in holy horror, that God may come in. Slavery, its exactions, robberies, kindred Sunderings, adulteries, bloody baptisms, human burnt offerings and its hellish trappings on God's image, Jesus' purchase, and the Spirits Temple—all all sit enthroned in the sanctuary of God, eat the sacramental bread, are baptized at the font, consecrated to minister at the altar, clad in sacred vestments and ushered into the holy of holies, to make it ring with blasphemies and reek with lust and smoke with the blood of its damnable abominations.

[Theodore Dwight Weld to Angelina Grimké
Weld, February 6, 17, 1842]

The almost universal bankruptcy that now whelms the south, the low price of their *only* great staple cotton, and the certainty that the price cannot rise on account of the supply rushing into European markets from immense regions just thrown open to the culture in the east, added to this the necessity of resorting to direct taxation for the support of the National government, the existing difficulties with Great Britain portending war at no great distance, and the certainty that in such a case the first demonstration would be made upon the southern coast and the standard of freedom to the slave unfurled every where, all these things and divers others, all brought by Gods providence in point blank range, the combustible trains all laid into the very centre of the magazine and the blazing brand waving over them, fills them with rage and consternation. Oh that they knew in this their day the things that belong to their peace! The slaveholders of the present generation, if cloven down by Gods judgments, cannot plead that they were *unwarned*. Warnings, reproofs, and the foreshadows of coming retribution have for years freighted the very air, and should sudden destruction come upon them now at last, well may the God of the oppressed cry out against them, "Because I have

called and ye have refused. I have stretched out my hand and no man hath regarded. But ye have set at nought my counsel and would none of my reproof. Therefore will I laugh at your calamity and mock when your fear cometh. When your fear cometh like desolation and destruction like a whirlwind, then shall ye call but I will not answer. Ye shall seek me early but ye shall not find me. Therefore shall ye eat of the fruit of your own ways and be filled with your own devices."

[Weld to Angelina Grimké Weld,
February 17, 1842]

That slavery has *begun* to fall is plain, but that its fall will be resisted by those who cling to it, with energy and desperation and fury such as only fiends can summon when they know their hour has come, the end will be slow. Woe to abolitionists if they dream that their work is well nigh done. What vigilance will be demanded for future crises! What zeal, fortitude, daring, patience of hope, and labors of love. The Infinite abolitionist must do the work. And He has begun it on a scale as broad as the world and He will so accomplish the work that other mighty revolutions will flow in its wake if not indeed ride upon its foremost waves. It has for some time impressed me with more than usual power that mighty delivering providences marshalled by God, wait and are striving for the start, delaying only for the watch word of faith and prayer. "For this I will be *inquired* of by the house of Israel to do it for them. He did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief. . . ."

3. *Abolitionist Behavior and Opinions.* The following selections present the Abolitionists in some of their most idealistic moods. The first two outline Weld's personal relations with the Negroes. The third, a letter from Whittier to the Grimké sisters, indicates the handicap under which a reform of the time might labor when its adherents were attracted to other movements. The final two letters are by Birney. One tells where the stronghold of Abolitionism lay and also shows that the reformers thought that not only God but all human history was against slavery. In the other, Birney advances the opinion that so meaningful is the struggle of the Abolitionists that every American is vitally concerned. His interpretation partially foreshadows the thought of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.¹²

[Theodore Dwight Weld to Lewis Tappan,
March 8, 1834]

Of the almost 3000 blacks in C[incinnati] more than three-fourths of the adults are emancipated

slaves, who worked out their own freedom. Many are now paying for themselves under large securities. Besides these, multitudes are toiling to purchase their friends, who are now in slavery.

I visited this week about 30 families, and found that some members of more than half these families were still in bondage, and the father, mother and children were struggling to lay up money enough to purchase their freedom. I found one man who had just finished paying for his wife and five children. Another man and wife who bought themselves some years ago, and have been working night and day to purchase their children; they had just redeemed the last! and had paid for themselves and children 1400 dollars! Another woman who had recently paid the last instalment of the purchase money for her husband. She had purchased him by taking in washing, and working late at night, after going out and performing as help at hard work. But I cannot tell half, and must stop. After spending three or four hours, and getting facts, I was forced to stop from sheer heart-ache and agony.

[Weld to Tappan, March 9, 1836]

As to my feelings toward the Colored people, suffice it to say [that] while I was at Lane Seminary my intercourse was with the Colored people of Cincinnati I think I may say *exclusively*. If I ate in the City it was at *their* tables. If I slept in the City it was at *their* homes. If I attended parties, it was *theirs*—*weddings*—*theirs*—*Funerals*—*theirs*—*Religious meetings*—*theirs*—*Sabbath schools*—*Bible classes*—*theirs*. During the 18 months that I spent at Lane Seminary I *did not attend Dr. Beechers Church once*. Nor did I ever attend any other of the Presbyterian Churches in the City except brother Mahans, and did not attend there more than half a dozen times during the whole time. The white methodist I attended once only. The rest of the time, when not called out to labor in the country, I was with the Colored people in their meetings by day and by night. If any one wishes to know what my *principles* and *practice* have been and are as to Intercourse with Colored people, I say let him ask the three thousand colored people in Cincinnati and if he asked it soberly they will laugh in his face.

[John Greenleaf Whittier to Sarah and Angelina Grimké, August 8, 1837]

I have been waiting for an opportunity to answer the letter which has been so kindly sent me. I am anxious, too, to hold a long conversation with you on the subject of *war*, human government, and church and family government. The more I reflect on this subject, the more difficulty I find, and the more decidedly am I of the opinion that we ought to hold all these matters far aloof

from the cause of abolition. Our good friend, H. C. Wright, with the best intentions in the world, is doing great injury by a different course. He is making the anti-slavery party responsible in a great degree for his, to say the least, startling opinions. I do not censure him for them, although I cannot subscribe to them in all their length and breadth. But let him keep them distinct from the cause of emancipation. This is his duty. Those who subscribe money to the Anti-Slavery Society do it in the belief that it will be spent in the propagation, not of Quakerism or Presbyterianism, but of the doctrines of Immediate Emancipation. To employ an agent who devotes half his time and talents to the propagation of "No human or no family government" doctrines in connection—*intimate connection*—with the doctrine of abolition, is a fraud upon the patrons of the cause. Just so with papers. Brother Garrison, I think, errs in this respect. He takes the "no church, and no human government" ground, as, for instance, in his Providence speech. Now, in his prospectus, he engaged to give his subscribers an anti-slavery paper, and his subscribers made their contract with him on that ground. If he fills his paper with Grahamism and no governmentism, he defrauds his subscribers. However, I know that brother Garrison does not look at it in this light.

In regard to another subject, "*the rights of woman*," you are now doing much and nobly to vindicate and assert the rights of woman. Your lectures to crowded and promiscuous audiences are a subject manifestly, in many of its aspects, *political*, interwoven with the framework of the government, are practical and powerful assertions of the right and the duty of woman to labor side by side with her brother for the welfare and redemption of the world. Why, then, let me ask, is it necessary for you to enter the lists as controversial writers in this question? Does it not *look*, dear sisters, like abandoning in some degree the cause of the poor and miserable slave, sighing from the cotton plantation of the Mississippi, and whose cries and groans are forever sounding in our ears, for the purpose of arguing and disputing about some trifling oppression, political or social, which we may ourselves suffer? Is it not forgetting the great and dreadful wrongs of the slave in a selfish crusade against some paltry grievance of our own? Forgive me if I have stated the case too strongly. I would not for the world interfere with you in matters of conscientious duty, but I wish you would weigh candidly the whole subject, and see if it does not *seem* an abandonment of your first love. Oh let us try to forget everything but our duty to God and our fellow beings; to dethrone the selfish principle, and to strive to win over the hard heart of the oppressor by truth kindly spoken. The Massachusetts Congregational

Association can do you no harm if you do not allow its splenetic and idle manifesto to divert your attention from the great and holy purpose of your souls.

[James G. Birney to Charles Hammond,
November 14, 1835]

Persecuted in the *cities*, whether it be by mobs made up of "gentlemen of property and standing" or by the mere refuse of tippling-houses and dram-shops,—they have only to fly to the *country* to be welcomed by the warm and honest hearts of our yeomanry, and by the artizans and inhabitants of the smaller villages—who, when the great principles of freedom are jeopardized [*sic*] can neither be intimidated by Slave-holding bluster, nor bribed by the factorage of Cotton-bales nor sugarhogs-heads however numerous they may be. . . .

Slavery produces on both parties, on him who has "power" as well as on him who is its victim and has "no comforter," tempers that are unhappy; it creates and flushes into action passions that are unceasingly straining themselves against the bonds, which bind communities together, and making war *and waving its crimson banners against benevolence*, the great principle of social life. If Slavery continue to increase in size and in vigor as it has done for the last twenty years, it must, before very long, burst those bonds, and exterminate this principle, and substitute for them the law for force and the bonds of oppression. Societies thus constituted cannot be prosperous, nor permanent nor blessed, because they oppose themselves to an inflexible law enacted by infinite wisdom, and guarded from overthrow by Almighty power. Of this the Roman Empire has furnished a memento to the world. Though wielding the power, both physical and moral of One Hundred and Twenty Millions of subjects and having in her hand the wealth of a plundered world, slavery—triumphant in the conflict—overthrew her giant adversary, and was seen, like a fiend, exulting for ages over its mighty glory defiled and prostrate in the dust. Persia, too, a nation of Slaves—tho' bloody, yet magnificent—shining in barbaric gold, and resplendent with the gorgeous pillage of human rights, fell, like an effeminate chamberer, or an unstrung drunkard before the adventurous energy of "iron-coated Macedon." Surely, Sir, it cannot be unnecessary to discuss, and by discussion to exterminate, an evil, which has crushed to death every nation it has embraced in its iron folds.

[James G. Birney to Gerrit Smith,
September 13, 1835]

I begin to think, it is time for Xians to leave the slaveholding States. With them I fear that all is lost. All the signs of the times, it seems to me

show, that they are to be visited with *judgments*. Our high profession, of freedom as a nation—our unparralleled [*sic*] religious privileges—our obdurate perserverance in the sin of oppression—the exhorbitant [*sic*] *claims* of the South on the liberties of the free states—demanding that every thing that has heretofore been deemed precious to them should be surrendered, in order that the Slaveholder might be perfectly at ease in his iniquity—all I say indicate that repentance is far off, if at all to be expected, and that God will avenge himself of a Nation like this. And yet it is not time for us to sit down and do nothing. It is as much as all the patriotism in our country can do, to keep alive the spirit of liberty in the *free states*. The contest is becoming—has become,—one, not alone of freedom for the *black* but of freedom for the *white*. It has now become absolutely necessary, that Slavery should cease in order that freedom may be preserved to any portion of our land. The antagonist principles of liberty and slavery have been roused into action and one or the other must be victorious. There will be no cessation of the strife, until Slavery shall be exterminated, or liberty destroyed.

4. *The Abolitionist Picture of Slavery*. In one sense the most significant thing about the Abolitionists was their picture of slavery. Always a small minority, tremendously unpopular even in the North, never able in an election to win any substantial segment of the American people to their program, they did prove successful in convincing the North that their representations about slavery were the truth. In 1839 Theodore Dwight Weld brought out an account of the institution. Until the appearance of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* this was the most popular item of the voluminous Abolitionist literature. Indeed Weld's tract provided the "factual data" which Harriet Beecher Stowe used in her novel. The selection is from the table of contents of Weld's *American Slavery As It Is: Testimony of a Thousand Witnesses*. (Page numbers have been deleted.)¹³ It bears comparison with the material of Problem VI.

NARRATIVE OF NEHEMIAH CAULKINS; North Carolina slavery; Methodist preaching slave-driver, Galloway; Woman at child-birth; Slaves at labor; Clothing of slaves; Allowance of provisions; Slave-fetters; Cruelties to slaves; Burying a slave alive; Licentiousness of Slaveholders; Rev. Thomas P. Hunt, with his "hands tied"; Preachers' cringe to slavery; Nakedness of slaves; Slave-huts; Means of subsistence for slaves; Slaves' prayer.

NARRATIVE OF REV. HORACE MOULTON; Labor of the slaves; Tasks; Whipping posts; Food;

Houses; Clothing; Punishments; Scenes of horror; Constables, savage and brutal; Patrols; Cruelties at night; *Paddle-torturing*; *Cat-hauling*; Branding with hot iron; Murder with impunity; Iron collars, yokes, clogs, and bells.

NARRATIVE OF SARAH M. GRIMKÉ; Barbarous Treatment of slaves; Converted slave; Professor of religion, near death, tortured his slave for visiting his companion; Counterpart of James Williams' description of Larrimore's wife; Head of runaway slave on a pole; Governor of North Carolina left his sick slave to perish; Cruelty to Women slaves; Christian slave a martyr for Jesus. . . .

TESTIMONY OF THE REV. WILLIAM T. ALLEN. Woman delivered of a dead child, being whipped; Slaves shot by Hilton; Cruelties to slaves; Whipping post; Assaults, and maimings; Murders; Puryear, "the Devil,"; Overseers always armed; Licentiousness of Overseers; "Bend your Backs"; Mrs. H., a Presbyterian, desirous to cut Arthur Tappan's throat; Clothing, Huts, and Herding of slaves; Iron yokes with prongs; Marriage unknown among slaves; Presbyterian minister at Huntsville; Concubinage in Preacher's house; Slavery the great wrong. . . .

PUNISHMENTS; Floggings; Witnesses and Testimony;

SLAVE DRIVING; Drovers of slaves;

CRUELTY TO SLAVES; Slaves like Stock without a shelter; "Six pound paddle,";

TORTURES OF SLAVES; Iron collars, chains, fetters, and hand-cuffs; Advertisements for fugitive slaves; Testimony; Iron head-frame; Chain coffles; Drovers of "human cattle"; Washington, the National slave market; Testimony of James K. Paulding, Secretary of the Navy;

LITERARY FRAUD and PRETENDED PROPHECY by Mr. Paulding; Brandings, Maimings, and Gun-shot wounds; Witnesses and Testimony; Mr. Sevier, senator of the U.S.; Judge Hitchcock, of Mobile; Commendable fidelity to truth in the advertisements of slave-holders; Thomas Aylethorpe cut off a slave's ear, and sent it to Lewis Tappan; Advertisements for runaway slaves with their teeth mutilated; Excessive cruelty to slaves; Slaves burned alive; Mr. Turner, a slave-butcher; Slaves roasted and flogged; Cruelties common; Fugitive slaves; Slaves forced to eat tobacco worms; Baptist Christians escaping from slavery; Christian whipped for praying; James K. Paulding's testimony; Slave driven to death; Coroner's inquest on Harney's murdered female slave; Man-stealing encouraged by law; Trial for a murdered slave; Female slave whipped to death, and during the torture delivered of a dead infant; Slaves murdered; Slave driven to death; Slaves killed with impunity; George, a slave, chopped piecemeal, and burnt by Lilburn Lewis; Retributive

justice in the awful death of Lilburn Lewis; Trial of Isham Lewis, a slave murderer.

5. *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Harriet Beecher Stowe was the daughter of a Connecticut Congregationalist minister, Lyman Beecher. Living at a Cincinnati seminary where her father presided and Theodore Dwight Weld converted many of the students to Abolitionism, she naturally acquired a dislike of slavery. But it was not until 1850 that her antislavery feelings became intense. In 1852 she published the novel *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Within a year several hundred thousand copies had been sold and it seemed probable that the Abolitionists had won their long struggle to spread horror of slavery and pity for the slaves. Many are the incidents from Mrs. Stowe's work worthy of presentation—the escape of Eliza over the ice, family scenes in "Tom's cabin," or the whipping of Uncle Tom. Because the student is already familiar with a slave auction (pp. 167–169), perhaps a similar episode from the novel will be useful in comparing the fictional with the actual. In making this comparison, the student may note discrepancies in such matters as the attitude of the slaves, character of the buyers, and events on the auction block. The scene is New Orleans whence Tom and Adolph have been brought after the death of their master, Augustine St. Clare. Susan and Emmeline are mother and daughter from a bankrupt New Orleans plantation.¹⁴

THE SLAVE WAREHOUSE

A SLAVE warehouse! Perhaps some of my readers conjure up horrible visions of such a place. They fancy some foul, obscure den, some horrible *Tartarus* "*informis, ingens, cui lumen ademptum*." But no, innocent friend, in these days men have learned the art of sinning expertly and genteelly, so as not to shock the eyes and senses of respectable society. Human property is high in the market; and is, therefore, well fed, well cleaned, tended, and looked after, that it may come to sale sleek, and strong, and shining. A slave-warehouse in New Orleans is a house externally not much unlike many others, kept with neatness; and where every day you may see arranged, under a sort of shed along the outside, rows of men and women, who stand there as a sign of the property sold within.

Then you shall be courteously entreated to call and examine, and shall find an abundance of husbands, wives, brothers, sisters, fathers, mothers, and young children, to be "sold separately, or in lots to suit the convenience of the purchaser;" and that soul immortal, once bought with blood

and anguish by the Son of God, when the earth shook, and the rocks rent, and the graves were opened, can be sold, leased, mortgaged, exchanged for groceries or dry goods, to suit the phases of trade, or the fancy of the purchaser.

The dealers in the human article make scrupulous and systematic efforts to promote noisy mirth among them, as a means of drowning reflection, and rendering them insensible to their condition. The whole object of the training to which the negro is put, from the time he is sold in the northern market till he arrives south, is systematically directed towards making him callous, unthinking, and brutal. The slave-dealer collects his gang in Virginia or Kentucky, and drives them to some convenient, healthy place,—often a watering place,—to be fattened. Here they are fed full daily; and, because some inclined to pine, a fiddle is kept commonly going among them, and they are made to dance daily; and he who refuses to be merry—in whose soul thoughts of wife, or child, or home, are too strong for him to be gay—is marked as sullen and dangerous, and subjected to all the evils which the ill will of an utterly irresponsible and hardened man can inflict upon him. Briskness, alertness, and cheerfulness of appearance, especially before observers, are constantly enforced upon them, both by the hope of thereby getting a good master, and the fear of all that the driver may bring upon them, if they prove unsaleable. . . .

Beneath a splendid dome were men of all nations, moving to and fro, over the marble pave. On every side of the circular area were little tribunes, or stations, for the use of speakers and auctioneers. Two of these, on opposite sides of the area, were now occupied by brilliant and talented gentlemen, enthusiastically forcing up, in English and French commingled, the bids of connoisseurs in their various wares. A third one, on the other side, still unoccupied, was surrounded by a group, waiting the moment of sale to begin. And here we may recognise the St. Clare servants,—Tom, Adolph, and others; and there, too, Susan and Emmeline, awaiting their turn with anxious and dejected faces. Various spectators, intending to purchase, or not intending, as the case might be, gathered around the group, handling, examining, and commenting on their various points and faces with the same freedom that a set of jockeys discuss the merits of a horse.

"Holloa, Alf! What brings you here?" said a young exquisite, slapping the shoulder of a sprucely-dressed young man, who was examining Adolph through an eye-glass.

"Well, I was wanting a valet, and I heard that St. Clare's lot was going. I thought I'd just look at his—"

"Catch me ever buying any of St. Clare's peo-

ple! Spoilt niggers, every one. Impudent as the devil!" said the other.

"Never fear that!" said the first. "If I get 'em, I'll soon have their airs out of them; they'll soon find that they've another kind of master to deal with than Monsieur St. Clare. 'Pon my word, I'll buy that fellow. I like the shape of him."

"You'll find it'll take all you've got to keep him. He's deucedly extravagant!"

"Yes, but my lord will find that he *can't* be extravagant with *me*. Just let him be sent to the calaboose a few times, and thoroughly dressed down! I'll tell you if it don't bring him to a sense of his ways! O, I'll reform him, up hill and down,—you'll see! I buy him, that's flat!"

Tom had been standing wistfully examining the multitude of faces thronging around him, for one whom he would wish to call master; and if you should ever be under the necessity, sir, of selecting, out of two hundred men, one who was to become your absolute owner and disposer, you would, perhaps, realize, just as Tom did, how few there were that you would feel at all comfortable in being made over to. Tom saw abundance of men,—great, burly, gruff men; little, chirping, dried men; long-favored, lank, hard men; and every variety of stubbed-looking, commonplace men, who pick up their fellow-men as one picks up chips, putting them into the fire or a basket with equal unconcern, according to their convenience; but he saw no St. Clare.

A little before the sale commenced, a short, broad, muscular man, in a checked shirt considerably open at the bosom, and pantaloons much the worse for dirt and wear, elbowed his way through the crowd, like one who is going actively into a business; and, coming up to the group, began to examine them systematically. From the moment that Tom saw him approaching, he felt an immediate and revolting horror at him, that increased as he came near. He was evidently, though short, of gigantic strength. His round, bullet head, large, light-gray eyes, with their shaggy, sandy eye-brows, and stiff, wiry, sun-burned hair, were rather unprepossessing items, it is to be confessed; his large, coarse mouth was distended with tobacco, the juice of which, from time to time, he ejected from him with great decision and explosive force; his hands were immensely large, hairy, sun-burned, freckled, and very dirty, and garnished with long nails, in a very foul condition. This man proceeded to a very free personal examination of the lot. He seized Tom by the jaw, and pulled open his mouth to inspect his teeth; made him strip up his sleeve, to show his muscle; turned him round, made him jump and spring, to show his paces.

"Where was you raised?" he added, briefly, to these investigations.

"In Kintuck, Mas'r," said Tom, looking about, as if for deliverance.

"What have you done?"

"Had care of Mas'r's farm," said Tom.

"Likely story!" said the other, shortly, as he passed on. He paused a moment before Dolph; then spitting a discharge of tobacco-juice on his well-blackened boots, and giving a contemptuous umph, he walked on. Again he stopped before Susan and Emmeline. He put out his heavy, dirty hand, and drew the girl towards him; passed it over her neck and bust, felt her arms, looked at her teeth, and then pushed her back against her mother, whose patient face showed the suffering she had been going through at every motion of the hideous stranger.

The girl was frightened, and began to cry.

"Stop that, you minx!" said the salesman; "no whimpering here,—the sale is going to begin." And accordingly the sale begun.

Adolph was knocked off, at a good sum, to the young gentleman who had previously stated his intention of buying him; and the other servants of the St. Clare lot went to various bidders.

"Now, up with you, boy! d'ye hear?" said the auctioneer to Tom.

Tom stepped upon the block, gave a few anxious looks round; all seemed mingled in a common, indistinct noise,—the clatter of the salesman crying off his qualifications in French and English, the quick fire of French and English bids; and almost in a moment came the final thump of the hammer, and the clear ring on the last syllable of the word "*dollars*," as the auctioneer announced his price, and Tom was made over.—He had a master!

He was pushed from the block;—the short, bullet-headed man seizing him roughly by the shoulder, pushed him to one side, saying, in a harsh voice, "Stand there, *you*!"

Tom hardly realized anything; but still the bidding went on,—rattling, clattering, now French, now English. Down goes the hammer again,—Susan is sold! She goes down from the block, stops, looks wistfully back,—her daughter stretches her hands towards her. She looks with agony in the face of the man who has bought her,—a respectable middle-aged man, of benevolent countenance.

"O, Mas'r, please do buy my daughter!"

"I'd like to, but I'm afraid I can't afford it!" said the gentleman, looking, with painful interest, as the young girl mounted the block, and looked around her with a frightened and timid glance.

The blood flushes painfully in her otherwise colorless cheek, her eye has a feverish fire, and her mother groans to see that she looks more beautiful than she ever saw her before. The auctioneer sees his advantage, and expatiates volubly in mingled

French and English, and bids rise in rapid succession.

"I'll do anything in reason," said the benevolent-looking gentleman, pressing in and joining with the bids. In a few moments they have run beyond his purse. He is silent; the auctioneer grows warmer; but bids gradually drop off. It lies now between an aristocratic old citizen and our bullet-headed acquaintance. The citizen bids for a few turns, contemptuously measuring his opponent; but the bullet-head has the advantage over him, both in obstinacy and concealed length of purse, and the controversy lasts but a moment; the hammer falls—he has got the girl, body and soul, unless God help her!

Her master is Mr. Legree, who owns a cotton

plantation on the Red river. She is pushed along into the same lot with Tom and two other men, and goes off, weeping as she goes.

The benevolent gentleman is sorry; but, then, the thing happens every day! One sees girls and mothers crying, at these sales, *always!* It can't be helped, &c.; and he walks off, with his acquisition, in another direction.

Two days after, the lawyer of the Christian firm of B. and Co., New York, sent on their money to them. On the reverse of that draft, so obtained, let them write these words of the great Paymaster, to whom they shall make up their account in a future day: "*When he maketh inquisition for blood, he forgetteth not the cry of the humble!*"

Part III.

RADICALISM AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

In their social and religious thought the Abolitionists were radical for the United States of their time. Indeed their moral indignation, their burning desire to destroy an institution, and their use of democratic and humanitarian aims place them in the very midstream of radicalism as Western civilization has come to know it since the eighteenth century. What would be the relation of North and South to these radicals? The Problems have given substantial attention to the ties of interest and sentiment which bound the two sections. It is not necessary to restate here the nature of these bands. All that need be said is that the American people found the nineteenth-century union rich in values. Intentionally or not, the Abolitionists were pursuing a course which might easily lead to the destruction of the union. More than this, there was no agreement between them and the North on the ultimate status of the Negro, for the latter section, except in several of the New England states, had not even extended the barest of political rights to the black, holding as the South did to ideas of racial superiority. Here was ample reason to bring the radical minority and the American people into bitter if not fatal conflict.

But many Americans could not make a decision so easily as all this would imply. For the radicals were relying on two sources for their ideas: the Bible and the Declaration of Independence. Both were sacred to the American people, one for religious teachings, the other for political doctrine. And here were the Abolitionists finding humanitarian inspiration in the religious source and drawing ideas of political and social equality from the famous statement of '76. What were Americans to do? If they showed preference for the union, they were open to the charge of denying their religious and political heritage. If they took seriously the radical beliefs, what would happen to the United States as a political entity? It was a torturing dilemma. The different attempts to resolve these opposing values make a strong chapter in American history, reverberations of which have come down even to our time.

A.

REACTION OF THE MAJORITY

1. *Suppression of the Lane Revolt.* Early in 1834 Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, Ohio, was the scene of Weld's first triumph. In an eighteen-day revival he converted almost the whole student body to Abolitionism. This raised widespread protest in a city intimately connected with Kentucky, a slave

state just across the river; whereupon the trustees took a course of action which led to the resignation of the converts.¹⁵

Three days later, on August twentieth, the executive committee met again and recommended to the board of trustees the following rules: that

the students' anti-slavery society should be abolished; that "any public meetings or discussions among the students, any public addresses by the students in the seminary or elsewhere, or any appeals or communications to the students at their meals or when assembled on other ordinary occasions, without the approbation of the faculty," should be prohibited on the pain of dismissal from the seminary; and that the power of dismissal should be vested in a committee of the board of trustees. The recommended rules were immediately published in order to warn the students on the ground; but they were not to be in force until acted upon by the board of trustees at their next meeting in October.

[Huntingdon Lyman to James A. Thome,
October 4, 1834]

They have already enacted that either the *Ex. Com.* or the faculty shall have the right to expell any student!! without assigning any reason!!!!

2. *The Press and Post Office.* Abolitionists perforce left the deep South. However, one of them, James G. Birney of Alabama, hoped to publish an antislavery sheet in Danville, Kentucky. Experience shattered his hopes.¹⁶

[James G. Birney to Joseph Healy, October 2, 1835]

I am well satisfied, that a newspaper professedly of the abolition character can not be published in this State. When the whole Church, with here and there an exception of individuals, is ready to rise up against it, what can be expected from the mass of the community? The Sunday Schools for the colored people have, I suppose, ceased generally throughout the State. The one here is still maintained, though greatly reduced in numbers since the reign of terror began. The Post Office here has been put under censorship of the P. Master, one of the most ignorant, unlettered and mobocratical of our citizens. For a month, I received no Anti S. Papers. I threatened a suit, provided my evidence to the fact of *detention*, and I am beginning again to receive my papers. Though, doubtless, great numbers are withheld that I have been accustomed to receive, I can not ascertain the *fact* of their having arrived at the Office here.

3. *The Death of Elijah P. Lovejoy.* Other methods used against the Abolitionists were cruder. On one occasion Lewis Tappan's house on Manhattan Island was sacked after he had been advised to leave town for his own and his family's safety. Many a mob from Vermont to Ohio silenced antislavery agents. Theodore Dwight Weld's lecture tours can be rediscovered through newspaper accounts of local riots, for he was the center of many.

But the most famous victim of mob action was Elijah P. Lovejoy (1802-37), Presbyterian minister and "martyr Abolitionist." In 1837 he undertook to publish a newspaper at Alton, a river town in southern Illinois. His first press was pushed into the Mississippi River before it printed a single line, and mobs destroyed three others when Lovejoy persisted in his plans. The fifth, arriving in November 1837, was placed in a warehouse where Lovejoy and other Abolitionists stood guard. The tragedy which followed was described in a small book by Edward Beecher, brother of Harriet Beecher Stowe. This was published in 1838.¹⁷

From the statement of the mayor it seems that an attack was apprehended; and that the matter was laid before the common council, and that they did not deem it necessary to take any action on the subject.

On account of the fatigue and watching of the preceding night, most of the defenders of the press who were in the store the night before were absent; and others took their place. The number was larger than at first intended in consequence of an increased apprehension of an attack. Their apprehensions were realized. An attack was commenced at about ten o'clock at night.

In order to render the narrative more clear it is necessary to say a few words concerning the structure and location of the store. It consisted of two long stone buildings, side by side, in one block, extending from the landing in Water street back to Second street; with doors and windows at each gable end, but with no windows at the sides. Hence it can be defended at the ends from within, but not at the sides. The roofs are of wood. The lots on each side being vacant, these stores form a detached block, accessible on every side.

About ten o'clock a mob, *already armed*, came and formed a line at the end of the store in Water street, and hailed those within. Mr. Gilman opened the end door of the third story, and asked what they wanted. They demanded the press. He, of course, refused to give it up; and earnestly entreated them to use no violence. He told them that the property was committed to his care; and that they should defend it at the risk and sacrifice of their lives. At the same time they had no ill will against them, and should deprecate doing them an injury. One of them, a leading individual among the friends of free inquiry at the late convention, replied, that they would have it at the sacrifice of their lives, and presented a pistol at him: upon which he retired.

They then went to the other end of the store and commenced an attack. They demolished two

or three windows with stones and fired two or three guns. As those within threw back the stones, one without was distinctly recognised and seen taking aim at one within: for it was a moonlight evening and persons could be distinctly seen and recognised.

A few guns were then fired by individuals from within, by which Lyman Bishop, one of the mob, was killed. The story that he was a mere stranger waiting for a boat, and that Mr. Lovejoy shot him, are alike incapable of proof. He was heard during the day by a person in whose employ he was, to express his intention to join the mob.

After this the mob retired for a few moments, and then returned with ladders which they lashed together to make them the proper length, and prepared to set fire to the roof.

About this time the mayor having been informed of the riot, came on to the ground: but having few to sustain him, was unable to compel the rioters to desist by force. They requested him to go into the store, and state to its defenders, that they were determined to have the press; and would not desist until they had accomplished their object; and agreed to suspend operations until his return. Attended by a justice of the peace he entered and delivered the message of the mob. . . .

However, they did not give it up. Mr. Gilman requested the mayor to call on certain citizens, to see if they could not prevent the destruction of the building. He said he could not: he had used his official authority in vain. He then asked him whether he should continue to defend the property by arms. This the mayor as he had previously done, authorised him to do. The mayor and the justice were then informed that the press would not be given up: and the decision was by them communicated to the mob. They then proceeded to fire the roof; taking care to keep on the side of the store where they were secure from the fire of those within.

It now became evident to the defenders that their means of defense, so long as they remained within, was cut off; and nothing remained but to attack the assailants without. It was a hazardous

step; but they determined to take it. A select number, of whom Mr. Lovejoy was one, undertook the work. They went out at the end, turned the corner, and saw one of the incendiaries on the ladder, and a number standing at the foot. They fired and it is supposed wounded, but did not kill him; and then, after continuing their fire some minutes and dispersing the mob, returned to load their guns. When they went out again no one was near the ladder, the assailants having secreted themselves as to be able to fire, unseen, on the defenders of the press as they came out. No assailants being in sight Mr. Lovejoy stood, and was looking round. Yet, though he saw no assailant, the eye of his murderer was on him. The object of hatred, deep, malignant and long continued, was fully before him—and the bloody tragedy was consummated. Five balls were lodged in his body, and he soon breathed his last. Yet after his mortal wound he had strength remaining to return to the building and ascend one flight of stairs before he fell and expired. They then attempted to capitulate, but were refused with curses by the mob, who threatened to burn the store and shoot them as they came out. Mr. Roff now determined at all hazards to go out and make some terms, but he was wounded as soon as he set his foot over the threshold.

The defenders then held a consultation. They were shut up within the building, unable to resist the ferocious mode of attack now adopted, and seemed devoted to destruction. At length Mr. West came to the door, informed them that the building was actually on fire, and urged them to escape by passing down the river bank; saying that he would stand between them and the assailants so that if they fired they must fire on him. This was done. All but two or three marched out and ran down Water street, being fired on by the mob as they went. Two, who were wounded, were left in the building, and one who was not, remained to take care of the body of their murdered brother. The mob then entered, destroyed the press and retired. Among them were seen some of those leading "friends of free inquiry" who had taken an active part in the convention.

B.

CRITICAL APPRAISAL

1. *Sympathetic Criticism.* There were some Americans who were genuinely antislavery but hesitant about declaring themselves Abolitionists. Two of the following letters explore their attitude. Simeon Salisbury, a Kentucky minister who neither hired nor owned slaves, expresses his view of the Negro question; while John Jones, a native of Glasgow, Kentucky, summarizes community opinion. Finally, even

Finney and the Grimké sisters, who were so intimately associated with the spirit of reform, entertained certain doubts about the Abolitionist movement.¹⁸

[Simeon Salisbury to James G. Birney,
March 7, 1835]

Your letter from Leexinton [*sic*] was received in due time, while I was absent from home. As I

did not return for some time, it got mislaid [*sic*] which has prevented my answering it sooner. I wish you much success [*sic*] in your undertaking the *object* of which I cannot but highly approve. I have however to confess that my views are not so clear with regard to the practicability of your contemplated society as to render it suitable for me at present to join it; and yet in many respects I feel strongly inclined to do it and think I may say with safety that it is my determination to render you all that encouragement my circumstances will permit. My point of difficulty is this—Supposing here are a parcel of slaves more or less, and I think, the majority are such, who are really unfit for freedom as children and minors are unfit to act for themselves. Shall I say to masters “Set them free at once.” That this would be right under existing cir[cumstances] I have *some* doubts; and yet when I see how entirely masters neglect what I think to be their duty I feel almost determined to do it. The way which I think would be most agreeable to the principles of duty is to insist upon all masters labouring to train their servants as wise enlightened christians labour to train their children for freedom. How this is, is easy to see. And I have no hesitation in saying with my present views of things that were I a slave, I would much rather my master would keep me under his control than to set me at liberty when I neither know what liberty is or how to use it. But it may be asked what masters do this? It is lamentable that the answer evidently is that almost none at all make even an attempt to do it. What they do is one thing and what they ought to do is another. It does strike me that, that master who should set himself in his plans actively to work for the improvement of his servants as wise christian parents do for to fit their children to act for themselves would do more as the principles of the gospel require than the one would, who should forthwith set them free and then labor to benefit them as he might be able. Had I slaves, this latter is the course which it now seems to me I should pursue. I mean in reference [*sic*] to those whom I think it would [do] to set free. Doubtless many might be set free at once and still live with and labor for their masters and in this way enable their masters to discharge their duties towards them better than they could do by holding their legal claims upon them. But that this would be best in all cases is that about which I am in doubt. Though for the reasons just stated I can not think it suitable at this time to subscribe your article, yet I can assure you I feel anxious to do any thing that may have a tendency to benefit this injured part of the human family among us. I shall be glad always to learn of your success and to receive any communication which you would wish to make.

[John Jones to James G. Birney, July 25, 1835]

The principle of immediate emancipation is very unpopular: the great Bugbear. Ask the questions: Is not slavery wrong? “Granted.” Is it not a very great sin against God, and contrary to every precept of the Gospel of Christ? “Admitted.” Is it not at variance with the genius of our Civil Institutions, and a reproach to our nation? “Certainly.” Is it not an evil of a destructive character, and is it not growing upon us? “We think so.” Ought we not to get rid of this evil? “Certainly.” As it has become evident that delay is dangerous ought we not to act efficiently, and immediately emancipate the slaves? “No we cannot agree to that. If some way could be contrived for sending them all out of our country, we would be glad to see them free; not otherwise.” Would not that be cruel? Change conditions [with them] and say that the condition of your freedom should [depend upon ship]ment to England or some other foreign country [would] you not think it very hard? “It would seem [so; but] set them free, and there would immediately commence such scenes of house burning, housebreaking, stealing, robbing, throatcutting, headbreaking, stonethrowing, brickbatting, etc. etc. as was never heard of before.” Well gentlemen, what think you of the gradual emancipation scheme? “Why sir, if they must be set free among us at all, we prefer that plan: The negro[e]s would thereby be somewhat prepared for freedom; and that shock to society, and those evils measurably averted, which according to the plan of the Immediatist, would be inevitable.” But gentlemen, we think you err by founding your arguments upon a false supposition, that the negro[e]s are, as it were, to be set free this afternoon or tomorrow, to go at large, and roam about the Country without restraint, without law, having more liberty than we ourselves have, or desire; with all their rasped feelings towards us in full flow, and our feelings towards them just as they are at present: whereas our principles show a better way. The poor negro[e]s, you will admit, are in a most wretched condition with regard to moral elevation, as well as in the being deprived of liberty; we rob them of the latter, then deprive them of the former, by keeping them ignorant, and humble them by keeping their minds, from infancy, subjected to a servile sway, that the possession may be more secure. The gradualist says, restore them the inferior right, (moral elevation) then give them the superior right, (liberty). The Immediatist says give them the superior right first, thereby convincing them you are in earnest, and by thus gaining their confidence and softening their hearts, they are better prepared for the reception of qualifications for freedom and usefulness. This principle when

acted out would be safe, and society could not possibly experience [harm] thereby. "Why sir, we must confess this looks reasonable; but we have an unconquerable aversion to having the negroes free among us."

[Charles G. Finney to Theodore Dwight Weld,
July 21, 1836]

My particular object in writing you at the present time is to talk with you about the present state of the church, our country, abolition, etc. Br. Weld is it not true, at least do you not fear it is, that we are in our present course going fast into a civil war? Will not our present movements in abolition result in that? Shall we not ere long be obliged to take refuge in a military despotism? Have you no fear of this? If not, why have you not? Nothing is more manifest to me than that the present movements will result in this, unless your mode of abolitionizing the country be greatly modified. To suggest to some minds what I have here said would be evidence either of a pro slavery spirit, or of cowardice. But D[ea]r Weld you *think*, and certainly you can not but discern the signs of the times. Now what is to be done? How can we save our country and affect the speedy abolition of slavery? The fact is, D[ea]r W[eld] our leading abolitionists are good men, but there are but few of them *wise* men. Some of them are reckless. Others are so denunciatory as to kill all prayer about it. There is very little confidence and concert among many of our abolitionists. It is high time that we understood each other.

[Sarah and Angelina Grimké to Theodore Dwight Weld, November 30, 1837]

. . . my heart sinks within me when I remember the fearful scenes at Alton. Will God continue to bless an enterprize which is baptised with blood? I read with sorrow the resolutions of the A[meri]can A[n]ti S[lavery] S[ociety], not even a regret expressed that violence had been resorted to. Surely to be consistent, abolitionists sh'd go South and help the slaves to obtain their freedom at the point of the bayonet. I believe the death of brother L[ovejoy] has given a deadly wound to abolition as a Christian enterprize; it is an hour of darkness and gloominess to me. And the religious exercises in N. Y. seemed almost impious to me, as if we intended to sanction and sanctify the crime of murder in self-defence.

2. *Webster on the Abolitionists.* In line with their original hopes that discussion and persuasion would rid the land of slavery, the Abolitionists sought to carry the subject to the floors of Congress. Southern members, believing that agitation of the matter anywhere constituted a threat to the union, were

loath to allow presentation of the topic, and both national parties, Whig and Democratic, were inclined for reasons of party unity to support the South. In 1836, however, John Quincy Adams, though not an Abolitionist, became the leader in the use of a technique to secure the discussion of slavery—that is, by using the constitutional right of petition. For several years busy Abolitionists collected thousands of signatures to petitions criticizing slavery, and flooded Congress with them. The House of Representatives then became the arena of battle between J. Q. Adams seeking to present these petitions for discussion and majority leaders curbing the right of petition through the constitutional power of the House to govern its own proceedings. These restraints, which the antislavery people called gag rules, were applied until 1844. However, with the election of Abolitionists, Joshua Giddings for example, the subject received a full airing. In the late 1840s the issue shifted to the question of slavery in the territories.

One of the most significant statements ever made in Congress about Abolition was Daniel Webster's well-known "Speech on the Constitution and the Union" (March 7, 1850). He was pleading for congressional acceptance of a series of compromises on the outstanding political questions between North and South.¹⁹

Then, Sir, there are those abolition societies, of which I am unwilling to speak, but in regard to which I have very clear notions and opinions. I do not think them useful. I think their operations for the last twenty years have produced nothing good or valuable. At the same time, I know thousands of them are honest and good men; perfectly well-meaning men. They have excited feelings; they think they must do something for the cause of liberty; and in their sphere of action, they do not see what else they can do, than to contribute to an abolition press, or an abolition society, or to pay an abolition lecturer. I do not mean to impute gross motives even to the leaders of these societies, but I am not blind to the consequences. I cannot but see what mischiefs their interference with the South has produced. And is it not plain to every man? Let any gentleman who doubts of that recur to the debates in the Virginia House of Delegates in 1832, and he will see with what freedom a proposition, made by Mr. Randolph for the gradual abolition of slavery, was discussed in that body. Every one spoke of slavery as he thought; very ignominious and disparaging names and epithets were applied to it. The debates in the House of Delegates on that occasion, I believe,

were all published. They were read by every colored man who could read, and if there were any who could not read, those debates were read to them by others. At that time Virginia was not unwilling nor afraid to discuss this question, and to let that part of her population know as much of it as they could learn. That was in 1832. As has been said by the honorable member from Carolina, these abolition societies commenced their course of action in 1835. It is said—I do not know how true it may be—that they sent incendiary publications into the slave States; at any event, they attempted to arouse, and did arouse, a very strong feeling; in other words, they created great agitation in the North against southern slavery. Well, what was the result? The bonds of the slaves were bound more firmly than before, their rivets were more strongly fastened. Public opinion, which in Virginia had begun to be exhibited against slavery, and was opening out for the discussion of the question, drew back and shut itself up in its castle. I wish to know whether any body in Virginia can, now, talk openly as Mr. Randolph, Gov. McDowell, and others talked there, openly, and sent their remarks to the press, in 1832. We all know the fact, and we all know the cause, and everything that this agitating people have done, has been, not to enlarge, but to restrain, not to set free, but to bind faster, the slave population of the South. That is my judgment. Sir, as I have said, I know many Abolitionists in my own neighborhood, very honest good people, misled, as I think, by strange enthusiasm; but they wish to do something, and they are called on to contribute, and they do contribute; and it is my firm opinion this day, that within the last twenty years, as much money has been collected and paid to abolition societies, abolition presses, and abolition lecturers, as would purchase the freedom of every slave, man, woman, and child in the State of Maryland, and send them all to Liberia. I have no doubt of it. But I have yet to learn that the benevolence of these abolition societies has at any time taken that particular turn. [Laughter.]

3. *Views of Modern Historians.* Of the three modern historians quoted below, Dwight L. Dumond seems concerned primarily with a defense of the Abolitionists, James G. Randall takes an adverse view, and Charles and Mary Beard neither justify nor condemn but seek to evaluate the historic importance of the Abolitionist movement.²⁰

[Dwight L. Dumond]

Listen to the noble Birney's letter of condolence to Gerrit Smith: "In the spring of '33, during my absence from home in the South, a

charming boy between five and six, and, *then*, our only daughter between three and four years old were taken away by the *Scarlet* fever within three weeks of each other. I had left them, a few weeks before, in fine health. Passing by the Post Office in Natchez, expecting but very little to find a letter for me *there* from home, I inquired, and one was given me informing me of the death of my boy. In New Orleans, in the midst of strangers, almost the very night before I expected to set out for home to sympathize with my anxious family in our loss, a friend stepped up to me in the public room and told me, that my only daughter was dead. Dear, dear bro. I know the riches of God's consolations, for I then felt them, as I trust you, and your dear wife do. What shall we render unto him for all his benefits? It may be, that he has taken your little one from the evil to come, and is preparing you for greater usefulness in the great work to which he is now summoning his children." Men not only made a profession of faith, they lived by faith. Had they not, the strongest among them would have broken under the terrific strain of the uncertainties and sorrows of life. Witness Robert Holman and Birney, the one heading for the heart of the Black Belt, the other pressing north to the land of freedom, kneeling in prayer by the horseback trail in the Kentucky wilderness, seeking guidance for Holman with relation to slavery; or Theodore Weld praying in the office of the hard-fisted attorney, Joshua Giddings, until the latter was convinced of the sin of slavery; or John J. Shipperd plodding along the trails of western Michigan, stopping at sundown to kneel in prayer at the top of a little knoll, rising and pledging his faith that here should be erected an institution of higher learning and Christian brotherhood; or follow Phebe Mathews among the Negroes of Cincinnati, where Weld said: "Often, when exhausted by over-toil, and weak from fasting and insufficient sleep, she threaded obscure lanes and dingy passages, stooping into cellars and climbing to garrets, kneeling on damp floors at dying beds, and weeping with those that wept, in sheds and hovels. She perfectly identified herself with the scorned and persecuted class for whom she was spent. She lived in their families, made them her companions, linked herself to their lot, shared with them their burdens and their bonds, and meekly bowed her head with theirs to the storm that swept over them." Or listen to the plaintive notes of the imperishable Negro spirituals and judge the importance of that Lane Seminary debate in which the "Sin of Slavery" was first pronounced in solemn tones. Men thought in terms of their children, and the legacy they sought to provide was something different from stocks and bonds and mortgages. They thought in terms

of the underprivileged, and it was not in terms of the dole. It was in terms of education, religion, and economic opportunity, those great collateral principles of political democracy: freedom and equality of opportunity for advancement, spiritually, mentally, and economically.

[James G. Randall]

This situation gave to many an agitator the chance to express his moral indignation, to battle for the right, and incidentally to serve his own sense of personal importance. For the coming conflict there was developing a terrible weapon—the avenging force of puritanism in politics. Nay, it was more than a weapon: it was a major cause of the conflict itself. A recent writer has characterized this spirit as follows:

"The origin of the spirit of coercion was not at Fort Sumter. Its origin was in the bitter zeal of righteous men. These men commonly belonged to a well-known type. With them, everything is idealized as good or bad. Their happiness, their sense of their own significance, is in identifying the good with their own ideas and convictions, and in destroying whatever fails to conform thereto. To them, slavery was bad in some unique and Satanic sense. . . . They were denied the spiritual exaltation of earlier men of their type in burning witches and heretics. But men of the type in every generation must have some means of self-expression, and that generation found a furious pleasure in assailing distant slave-holders. In their delusion of unselfish devotion to the good, men of the type persist in serving at all costs their own sense of identity with the good, their own sense of superiority and significance. It never occurs to them that the method of destroying what they assume to be bad may have more badness in it than the thing destroyed. Nor do they readily realize that the attainment of desirable ends may be retarded rather than promoted by stigmatizing opponents with evil motives and by antagonizing them with threats of coercion."

A character-portrait of one man will serve as an index or baedeker to the type of radical-reformer. Such a man was Joshua R. Giddings of Ohio, who in 1859 completed twenty years of stormy service in the House of Representatives. A compelling persistence in pursuing an ideal was his outstanding characteristic, and with it extravagance of language, indifference to the niceties of courteous intercourse, and unshakable devotion to an objective. There was in his manner a standing-at-Armageddon attitude, not only battling for the Lord but hurling Olympian invectives and invoking almighty sanctions against opponents. Confident that his own motives were faultlessly pure, he was sure that all the right was on one side and that his adversaries' impulses

were villainous and wicked. His speeches reveal that failure to see life whole, that lack of a sense of humor, that pertinacious meddling, and that tendency toward insulting bitterness, which mark the uncompromising crusader.

[Charles A. and Mary R. Beard]

How deeply this agitation went and how many people were really stirred by it can hardly be determined. According to all available figures the smoke was larger than the fire. One historian of the movement estimated that at the height of the struggle there were in the whole country about two thousand anti-slavery societies with approximately two hundred thousand members. Another reckoning placed the number of petitioners who signed the anti-slavery documents, presented by John Quincy Adams to the House of Representatives, at three hundred thousand. But when some of the abolitionists, greatly overrating their strength, entered the political field in 1844 with their Liberty party, they could muster only sixty-five thousand recruits from among the two and a half million voters who cast their ballots in that election. That was America's answer to a direct call for abolition and, now fully apprised of their voting strength, the advocates of the doctrine never again ventured to present a candidate to the suffrages of their countrymen.

In other words, immediate and unconditional emancipation as the rallying cry for a political party was from the beginning to the end a total failure. If, therefore, the realization of the abolition program had depended on the capture of a majority of the voters, if other factors than moral education had not intervened, the agitators might have waged a forlorn battle indefinitely. In any event, twenty years after Garrison launched *The Liberator*, the Democratic party on a positive pro-slavery platform carried every state in the Union except four; and that was in 1852, many months after the appearance of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, which filled the country with the turbulence of debate. "It deepens the horror of slavery," wrote Ticknor of that novel, "but it does not change a single vote." The balloting seemed to warrant his assertion.

Nevertheless it appears that the influence of the abolition agitation far outran the measurements that were taken at the polls. Within six years after Garrison hoisted his flag in Boston, John Quincy Adams wrote in his diary—not for immediate political purposes—these revealing words: "The public mind in my own district and state is convulsed between the slavery and abolition questions, and I walk on the edge of a precipice in every step that I take." In the same year, 1837, Webster openly declared that the anti-slavery feeling was not to be "trifled with or despised."

In the Senate, his southern colleague, Calhoun, professed to be deeply frightened by it, making in reply, two years later, his famous speech in defense of slavery which called for an unconditional suppression of the abolition agitation as the price of continued Union.

If some were inclined to discount such alarms as mere political effervescence, the fact remained that in several northern states where the parties were fairly equal a few voters held the balance of power and on various occasions exercised their prerogative with deadly effect. In the election of 1844, for instance, the anti-slavery candidate, by taking a few thousand votes away from Clay, the Whig leader, gave the presidency to James K. Polk of Tennessee, spokesman of the Democracy. Continually haunted by fear of such schisms, poli-

ticians bent on the possession of office and power had to be careful lest a tiny minority of agitators throw their entire national machine out of gear.

So, after all, the abolitionists did not have to muster a conquering host to frighten the managers of party affairs and to advance their own designs. By little threats, they forced many a Whig candidate out into the open and in turn helped to consolidate all wavering forces in the South behind a single banner—safety to slavery. At the same time they compelled many a northern Democrat to speak softly on the excellence of “the peculiar institution” when he would fain have rallied whole-heartedly to his southern brethren. In a word, the fortunes of politics often hung upon the maneuvers of a “contemptible minority.”

VIII

Slavery in Politics

THE whole controversy over the Territories, as remarked by a witty representative from the South, related to an imaginary negro in an impossible place.

JAMES G. BLAINE *Twenty Years in Congress*

CONTENTS

Questions for Study	214
Historical Background	215
Part I: Slavery and the Constitution	217
Part II: The Climax of the Slavery Controversy	236

QUESTIONS FOR STUDY

1. If John C. Calhoun's interpretation of the status of slavery in the Territories were valid, what implications would follow for the Missouri Compromise?
2. Was the Missouri Compromise a general formula to take care of all territory at any time or was it limited in its application?
3. Webster was violently assailed by the Abolitionists for taking a proslavery position in his Seventh of March Speech. Would he have admitted this? Would Calhoun have admitted it? How does Webster's view relate to the quotation on the title page of this Problem?
4. What features of the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 led to the criticism that it did not provide for a just trial for persons claimed as fugitives?
5. How does the record of the Anthony Burns case illustrate northern belief that the South violated the Declaration of Independence and southern belief that the North violated the Constitution?
6. Why did the admission of slaves to Kansas and Nebraska Territories in 1854 precipitate an extreme crisis, whereas the admission of slaves to Utah and New Mexico Territories in 1850 had received general endorsement?
7. When the Dred Scott decision declared the Missouri Compromise unconstitutional, that Act had already been repealed. The real implications of the decision, therefore, were in their bearing on the doctrine of popular sovereignty. Explain.
8. In Part I, Section A, four major attitudes toward the territorial question are indicated. Which of these four does the Dred Scott decision most closely resemble?
9. Summarize the leading points in Lincoln's argument denying that popular sovereignty was simply a matter of letting people in the territories, like the people in the states, exercise self-government in the regulation of a local institution.
10. At the beginning of this Problem it is stated that the slavery question was in reality two questions, ethical and political. How do Lincoln's views and his position illustrate this dualism?
11. To what extent was Lincoln the champion of the rights of the Negro?
12. Did the Abolitionists regard Lincoln as a representative of their cause and his election as a victory for their principles? Show four items of evidence which bear on this question.
13. What is some of the evidence for regarding Lincoln's election as a menace to the slavery system?
14. Compare Professor Randall's appraisal of the territorial question with Daniel Webster's appraisal. If Randall's be accepted, what does it imply as to the quality of Lincoln's statesmanship at this time?

What has been called the slavery question was in reality not one issue but two. In the first place it was an ethical question whether slaveholding could be justified morally. In the second place it was a political question what the federal government ought to do about it. Many people thoughtlessly assume that the two questions coincided for practical purposes and that if a person disapproved of slavery he automatically supported its abolition by federal law. This, however, was very far from being the case; although the time came when northern opinion overwhelmingly condemned slavery on moral grounds, there was never a time when northern voters gave appreciable support to any political party advocating direct abolition.

Behind this paradox lay a bewildering conflict of loyalties for those who tried to uphold all parts of the creed of American nationalism. In its broadest sense this creed required loyalty to the democratic concepts of liberty and the rights of man as expressed in the Declaration of Independence. No one who accepted fully this part of the national faith could continue to countenance slavery. At the same time, however, American nationalism also required loyalty to the Constitution and the union. No one who accepted this aspect could crusade against slavery, for such sectional tactics endangered the harmony of the union. Moreover, the Constitution, without specifically mentioning slavery, had given explicit recognition to the institution. It had provided that representation in Congress should be "apportioned among the several states . . . according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons"; it had also declared with reference to runaway slaves that, "No person held to service or labor in one state, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due." No loyal citizen of the republic, according to this requirement, could refuse to send fugitive slaves back to their masters. Furthermore, Americanism included the doctrine that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Applied to individual slaves in a slave state, this principle clearly required that the slaves be freed, but the same principle applied to the state as a whole required that abolition laws should not be forced on the citizens without their consent.

In sum, a strong nationalistic antislavery impulse drove against a barrier of strong nationalistic constitutional inhibitions. To resolve this conflict the primary response of people in the North was to abolish slavery within their own states, as they did in Vermont, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, and to regard it in other states as a local problem, the responsibility of which lay with the state rather than the central government. Such a view was easier to adopt at that time than it would be today, for federal power had not begun to approach its present extent and many functions now exercised by the central government, such as the control of wages and hours of labor, the enlistment of troops in wartime, and the like, were left to the states. In the United States one hundred years ago people might regard a condition in a neighboring state somewhat as they would regard an evil in a neighboring country in the twentieth century—that is, as a regrettable matter but not one requiring action by them.

In certain respects, therefore, this decision to limit the slavery question to the realm of local action seemed a workable solution of the dilemma and indeed operated successfully enough to enable the republic to stand, even as a "house

divided against itself," for seventy years. But at best this expedient merely segregated and did not reconcile the opposing forces, and as the antislavery crusade gained momentum the truce grew more and more uneasy. The factor of constitutional inhibition, however, did have the effect of causing this antislavery impulse to express itself politically, not in an outright assault upon the bondage of four million people but in a series of bitter contests over certain peripheral matters such as the status of slavery in the District of Columbia, the laws for the recovery of fugitive slaves, and, most of all, the extension of slavery into the new areas that were acquired as the United States expanded toward the Pacific Coast. It is this indirectness in the political operation of antislavery which makes the Kansas-Nebraska Act, the Dred Scott decision, the Freeport Doctrine, and other such matters seem perplexing to many students to whom the underlying issue is clear.

These selections on slavery in politics attempt, first, to develop more fully the paradox involved in the moral and political aspects of slavery and, second, to trace the efforts to neutralize the antagonism of these factors. Next comes an analysis of the way in which the question continued to arise in new and indirect forms despite attempted neutralization. In Part II of the Problem the debates between Abraham Lincoln and Stephen A. Douglas will be used for a study of the contrasting positions of these two men. Questions will then arise as to whether political leadership grappled with the problem in a realistic way and whether the programs of Lincoln and Douglas offered the public any basic choice between the courses of slavery and freedom.

Part I.

SLAVERY AND THE CONSTITUTION

Much of the success of the Constitution resulted, as is well known, not from the thoroughness with which it applied any single set of principles but from the skillful blending, by compromise, of opposing principles. Problem II has shown this in connection with the large states and the small states; another important compromise dealt with slavery. The southern states secured a guarantee that three fifths of the slaves would be counted for purposes of representation, that the African slave trade would not be prohibited by federal act for twenty years, and that fugitive slaves would be returned by the states into which they should flee. These guarantees to the South were like the assurances to the small states of equal representation in the Senate: they were part of the price paid for ratification.

One might suppose that contests would have arisen over the fulfilment of these provisions; but one of the greatest points of strength in nineteenth-century American democracy was the readiness of political groups to accept the decision of the majority without further dissent, no matter how spirited their opposition had earlier been. This applied to the slavery question as to many other aspects, and thus the three-fifths ratio was faithfully applied, a law for the rendition of fugitives was adopted in 1793, and the African slave trade remained exempt from federal restriction until 1808. In these matters where the mandate of the Constitution clearly controlled, even the Abolitionists did not deny the obligation, though they denounced the Constitution for imposing it. Thus William Lloyd Garrison deeply shocked many Americans by condemning the Constitution as "a covenant with death and an agreement with hell."

Most people, regardless of their views on slavery, venerated the Constitution, and the opponents of slavery could not therefore effectively challenge the institution except at those points where the Constitution did not apply or where its meaning lacked certainty. These included questions on the interstate slave trade, on the exact extent of the obligation to return fugitives, on slavery in the territories or the District of Columbia, on the rights of southern citizens to travel with their slaves in free states, on the status of slavery at arsenals, forts, navy yards and other government property, on the right to introduce antislavery petitions in the Congress, and the like. Of all these questions the territorial issue held most intrinsic importance because of the rapid expansion of the country westward, while the fugitive-slave issue had the strongest emotional impact because of the drama inherent in the spectacle of a slave exposing himself to a man hunt in his quest for freedom.

For several decades these questions were handled in the spirit of the Constitution itself—that is, in the spirit of compromise. Although no formal amendments dealt with slavery, at least two major compromises were arranged which were almost like appendixes to the Constitution. Until 1850, therefore, the principle of compromise seemed to succeed amid increasing difficulties. But after 1850 the framework of compromise started to disintegrate, and the supreme Constitutional crisis in the history of the republic began to emerge.

The selections will show something of the system of compromise and will suggest why this system came under increasing strain. They will further show how the developments between 1854 and 1857 destroyed the formulas of conciliation and precipitated a situation in which both the opportunity and the resolution of purpose to maintain compromise grew steadily weaker.

A. THE PATTERN OF COMPROMISE: SLAVERY IN THE TERRITORIES

A key fact of American history between 1790 and 1861 was the constant growth of the republic from a union of thirteen states to one of thirty-three. This growth took place normally through a process of organizing new areas as territories which would later become states. By 1861 fifteen states had passed through the territorial stage, and only in a few

exceptional cases, such as those of Texas and California, had this preliminary phase been omitted.

A territory, therefore, was in no sense merely an area of land. It was a governmental organization preparatory for statehood. Accordingly, the position which slavery took in the territory was likely to be the position that it would have in the state. Congress, of course, had no power to regulate slavery in any state, old or new (the new acquiring full equality with the old), and it could fix no terms of admission to statehood which were legally binding upon the state after admission. But it did possess authority to "make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States." Legislators at first assumed that this involved a Congressional power to admit or exclude slavery in the territories. Thus, despite the lack of legal control of slavery in the states, it appeared that Congress could in reality fix the destiny of the institution in any new area by means of its control during the formative territorial phase. Ultimately this power of Congress over the territories was denied, but so long as it operated, the acquisition of new areas and the organization of new territories was always likely to produce a crisis in the slavery question.

The history of national expansion, therefore, carried with it a constant problem of the handling of the territorial question of slavery. This problem arose in connection with three major areas, and on each occasion it received a different solution, though a factor of compromise was always involved.

The first area, the one in which the adjustment proved easiest, was the region between the Appalachian Mountains and the Mississippi River. The United States acquired this land by the treaty of 1783 at the end of the American Revolution, but the precise disposition of the region for a time was rendered uncertain by the fact that a number of states held western claims derived from their colonial grants. One by one the states gradually renounced these claims or, more properly, transferred them to the central government. The land north of the Ohio was completely cleared by 1787, but the region south of this river did not even begin to pass into federal hands until North Carolina ceded the Tennessee region in 1790. As a result the old Congress under the Articles was able to organize the Northwest Territory, as it was called, by the Ordinance of 1787, whereas the Southwest Territory was not created until 1790 after the new government had come in. It was a period when Revolutionary ideals still ran strong. Accordingly the first territory contained as part of its basic law a prohibition of slavery. Under a series of provisions which were declared to be "articles of compact . . . forever unalterable . . . between the original states and the people and states in said territory," slavery and involuntary servitude were specifically excluded.

This eliminated slavery in the territories north of the Ohio. It is possible that if Congress had had a free hand it might have applied a similar exclusion in 1790 to the Tennessee area, but North Carolina had ceded the region on condition that "no regulation, made or to be made, by Congress, shall tend to emancipate slaves." Accepting this condition as part of the grant, Congress organized the Southwest Territory with a protected status for slavery. A similar arrangement was applied to the Mississippi Territory in 1798. Meanwhile, Kentucky had been admitted as a slave state in 1792 without previous territorial status. Together, these decisions seemed to indicate that slavery would in general be allowed south of the Ohio and excluded north of it. Thus the status of slavery appeared to be settled throughout the United States, either by state control or by these territorial arrangements.

This settlement remained complete until the Louisiana Purchase (1803), which doubled the area of the country and extended the boundaries westward from the Mississippi to the Continental Divide of the Rocky Mountains. The new region seemed infinitely remote, and until 1820 it presented only one candidate for statehood. This was Louisiana proper, in which slavery was allowed pretty much without protest because it had been transmitted as a heritage of the French and Spanish regime. When Missouri applied for admission in 1820, however, the situation seemed altogether different. This was a newly settled region and one which lay farther north than other slave territories. It was in fact in the latitude of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. Moreover, its application came at a time when the free and slave states maintained a precarious balance with one another. The thirteen original states had stood six slave and seven free after the acts of emancipation by the northeastern states, but at the end of the eighteenth century the admission of two slave states,

Kentucky and Tennessee, and one free, Vermont, had created an exact balance. Thereafter Ohio entered free in 1803, followed by Louisiana, a slave state, nine years later. Indiana, free, in 1816 was balanced by Mississippi in 1817, and Illinois, free, in 1818 by Alabama in 1819.

Thus matters stood when Missouri applied for statehood. Its admission would secure to slavery a new preponderance and a foothold at new latitudes in a new region. It was quite natural that a contest resulted. The House of Representatives, with free-state congressmen in control, passed a bill requiring Missouri to abolish slavery before she could be admitted. The Senate rejected this measure and a deadlock ensued. Tempers, as the selection from William Plumer in Problem III (p. 89) has shown, ran extremely high, and a prolonged crisis might have followed if Maine had not at this juncture applied for admission as a free state. The possibility of another pairing of slave and free states rendered Missouri's application more acceptable and both states gained admission; but as part of the price of Missouri's statehood, Congress imposed a general rule for all the remainder of the Louisiana Territory. This rule required that throughout the entire territory, except only Missouri, slavery should be excluded north of the line 36° 30', which was the southern boundary of Missouri. Thus, about three fourths of the Louisiana Purchase was dedicated to freedom. Once again it appeared that the status of slavery had been settled for every part of the United States and that no opportunity existed for further dissension.

For the next twenty-six years the question of slavery in the territories did not arise in an acute form. Florida and Oregon came upon the scene, unconnected with either the original United States or the Louisiana acquisition; but one seemed obviously destined to a slaveholding, the other to a nonslaveholding status, and these indications were accepted without much contest. Texas provoked a far more heated altercation; indeed, for nearly ten years antislavery forces blocked the annexation of the Lone Star republic. But when the annexationists triumphed, they brought Texas in with full statehood and thus avoided the territorial question.

The Mexican War, however, reopened this question in its most critical form. The course of the war soon foreshadowed an American acquisition of California and the Southwest. Would these areas in slave state latitudes become slave territories? Was aggrandizement of slavery the object of the war? Antislavery leaders concluded that it was, and they determined to frustrate the proslavery interests by means of the Wilmot Proviso, which would exclude slavery in advance from any territory acquired from Mexico as a result of the war (Texas, having been acquired before the war, was not included in this). This measure—the most famous, perhaps, of all bills that have failed to pass—was repeatedly adopted by the House, never by the Senate. But it produced a more acute and far more protracted crisis than that of 1820. Southern congressmen spoke freely of secession, and an almost unbearable tension continued from 1847 to 1850.

Finally, the very acuteness of the emergency led to a solution, for it sobered all except the most extreme partisans and enabled Henry Clay and Stephen A. Douglas to put through a series of measures which became known as the Compromise of 1850. This Compromise attempted a comprehensive settlement of all aspects of the slavery question. For the District of Columbia it guaranteed slavery while abolishing the slave trade. For the slave states it guaranteed that the slave trade would not be interrupted, and it offered a more drastic law for the recovery of fugitive slaves. But all these questions were secondary to the problem of the Mexican cession. Here Clay's solution was to admit California as a free state and to organize two large territories, Utah and New Mexico, with no provision whatever about slavery except the pledge that "when admitted as a state, the said territory or any portion of the same, shall be received into the Union, with or without slavery, as their constitution may prescribe at the time of their admission."

For the state, ultimately, this was clear enough, but for the territory, immediately, it involved a certain ambiguity that was probably intentional. The absence of any Constitutional restriction might be construed, as southern leaders construed it, to mean that all restrictions upon slavery in these territories were removed, at least for the duration of territorial status; it might be construed, according to northern Democrats, to leave the question in the hands of the territorial legislature, in conformity with the good democratic principle of local self-government; it might even mean that the courts would determine the question in the light of Spanish and American law. In short, the act might be regarded

either as promoting or as hindering slavery. Since it was no longer possible to agree on a compromise which everyone would understand in the same way, the compromise employed terms which could be understood in different ways. Thus, instead of being adjusted, the disagreement was merely concealed. So far as it went, however, the compromise seemed at least to take the question out of Congress, and it could be argued that, once more, complete arrangements existed for the entire United States: (1) the states controlled the question for themselves; (2) the Missouri Compromise controlled territories in the Louisiana Purchase; and (3) the Compromise of 1850 controlled territories in the Mexican Cession.

The debates connected with the Compromise of 1850 were linked with the tradition of the past in that they produced the last of the great compromise arrangements which on a number of historic occasions had saved the union from disruption. But they were also linked with the future in that they evoked the full range of opinions on the slavery and territorial questions and caused a number of leaders to develop arguments which represented the final positions of their respective groups. Since the slavery question here reached its matured form as a focus of sectional antagonisms, the positions of the principal groups provide basic insight into the developments and events that led during the next decade to the final breakdown of voluntary union.

1. *Southern Opinion after 1848: Calhoun.* In 1847 John C. Calhoun introduced in the Senate a series of resolutions setting forth the claims of the South to certain Constitutional rights in the territories. The gist of these resolutions was presented in a speech at Charleston the same year. During the debates in the Senate in 1850 he went beyond the territorial question as such and stated in broader terms his analysis of the reasons for the growth of sectional antagonism and his fears for the future of the union. This represented the final statement of Calhoun's views, for he died during the same month.¹

[Speech at Charleston Explaining the Resolutions on Slavery in the Territories]

... after all that has occurred during the last twelve months, it would be almost idiotic to doubt that a large majority of both parties in the non-slaveholding States have come to a fixed determination to appropriate all the territories of the United States now possessed, or hereafter to be acquired, to themselves, to the entire exclusion of the slaveholding States. Assuming, then, that to be beyond doubt, the grave, and, to us, vital question is presented for consideration: Have they the power to carry this determination into effect? . . .

I now return to the question, and answer,—Yes, they have the power, as far as mere numbers can give it. They will have a majority in the next Congress in every department of the Federal Government. The admission of Iowa and Wisconsin will give them two additional States, and a majority of four in the Senate, which heretofore has been our shield against this and other dangers of the kind. We are already in a minority in the House of Representatives and the Electoral College; so that, with the loss of the Senate, we shall be in a minority in every department of the Fed-

eral Government, and ever must continue so if the non-slaveholding States should carry into effect their scheme of appropriating to their exclusive use all the territories of the United States. But, fortunately, under our system of government, mere numbers are not the only element of power. There are others, which would give us ample means of defending ourselves against the threatened danger, if we should be true to ourselves.

We have, in the first place, the advantage of having the constitution on our side, clearly and unquestionably, and in its entire fabric; so much so, that the whole body of the instrument stands opposed to their scheme of appropriating the territories to themselves. To make good this assertion, it is only necessary to remind you, that ours is a federal, and not a national or consolidated Government—a distinction essential to a correct understanding of the constitution, and our safety. It ought never to be forgotten or overlooked. As a federal Government, the States composing the Union are its constituents, and stand in the same relation to it, in that respect, as the individual citizens of a State do to its government. As constituent members of the Union, all the territories and other property of the Union belong to them as joint owners or partners, and not to the Government, as is erroneously supposed by some. The Government is but the agent intrusted with the management; and hence the constitution expressly declares the territory to be the property of the United States—that is, the States united, or the States of the Union, which are but synonymous expressions. And hence, also, Congress has no more right to appropriate the territories of the United States to the use of any portion of the States, to the exclusion of the others, than it has to appropriate in the same way, the forts, or other public buildings, or the navy, or any other property of the United States. That it has such a right, no one would venture to assert; and yet the one is

placed exactly on the same ground with the other, by the constitution.

It was on this solid foundation that I placed the right of the slaveholding States to a full and equal participation in the territories of the United States, in opposition to the determination of the non-slaveholding States to appropriate them exclusively to themselves.

[Speech in the Senate, March 4, 1850]

I have, Senators, believed from the first that the agitation of the subject of slavery would, if not prevented by some timely and effective measure, end in disunion. Entertaining this opinion, I have, on all proper occasions, endeavored to call the attention of both the two great parties which divide the country, to adopt some measure to prevent so great a disaster, but without success. The agitation has been permitted to proceed, with almost no attempt to resist it, until it has reached a point when it can no longer be disguised or denied that the Union is in danger. You have thus had forced upon you the greatest and the gravest question that can ever come under your consideration—How can the Union be preserved?

To give a satisfactory answer to this mighty question, it is indispensable to have an accurate and thorough knowledge of the nature and the character of the cause by which the Union is endangered. . . . The first question, then, presented for consideration, in the investigation I propose to make, in order to obtain such knowledge, is—What is it that has endangered the Union?

To this question there can be but one answer,—that the immediate cause is the almost universal discontent which pervades all the States composing the Southern section of the Union. This widely-extended discontent is not of recent origin. It commenced with the agitation of the slavery question, and has been increasing ever since. The next question, going one step further back, is—What has caused this widely diffused and almost universal discontent?

It is a great mistake to suppose, as is by some, that it originated with demagogues, who excited the discontent with the intention of aiding their personal advancement, or with the disappointed ambition of certain politicians, who resorted to it as the means of retrieving their fortunes. On the contrary, all the great political influences of the section were arrayed against excitement, and exerted to the utmost to keep the people quiet. The great mass of the people of the South were divided, as in the other section, into Whigs and Democrats. The leaders and the presses of both parties in the South were very solicitous to prevent excitement and to preserve quiet; because it was seen that the effects of the former would necessarily tend to weaken, if not destroy, the

political ties which united them with their respective parties in the other section. Those who know the strength of party ties will readily appreciate the immense force which this cause exerted against agitation, and in favor of preserving quiet. But, great as it was, it was not sufficient to prevent the wide-spread discontent which now pervades the section. No; some cause, far deeper and more powerful than the one supposed, must exist, to account for discontent so wide and deep. The question then recurs—What is the cause of this discontent? It will be found in the belief of the people of the Southern States, as prevalent as the discontent itself, that they cannot remain, as things now are, consistently with honor and safety, in the Union. The next question to be considered is—What has caused this belief?

One of the causes is, undoubtedly, to be traced to the long-continued agitation of the slave question on the part of the North, and the many aggressions which they have made on the rights of the South during the time. I will not enumerate them at present, as it will be done hereafter in its proper place.

There is another lying back of it—with which this is intimately connected—that may be regarded as the great and primary cause. This is to be found in the fact that the equilibrium between the two sections, in the Government as it stood when the constitution was ratified and the Government put in action, has been destroyed. At that time there was nearly a perfect equilibrium between the two, which afforded ample means to each to protect itself against the aggression of the other; but, as it now stands, one section has the exclusive power of controlling the Government, which leaves the other without any adequate means of protecting itself against its encroachment and oppression.

[Here Calhoun gives statistics to prove the predominance of the North economically, and shows that the increase of free states and free state population is about to “destroy the equilibrium of the two sections in Congress.”]

Had this destruction been the operation of time, without the interference of Government, the South would have had no reason to complain; but such was not the fact. It was caused by the legislation of this Government, which was appointed, as the common agent of all, and charged with the protection of the interests and security of all. The legislation by which it has been effected, may be classed under three heads. The first is, that series of acts by which the South has been excluded from the common territory belonging to all the States as members of the Federal Union—which have had the effect of extending vastly the portion allotted to the Northern section, and restricting within narrow limits the portion left the South. The next consists in adopting a system of revenue and dis-

bursements, by which an undue proportion of the burden of taxation has been imposed upon the South, and an undue proportion of its proceeds appropriated to the North; and the last is a system of political measures, by which the original character of the Government has been radically changed. I propose to bestow upon each of these, in the order they stand, a few remarks, with the view of showing that it is owing to the action of this Government, that the equilibrium between the two sections has been destroyed, and the whole powers of the system centered in a sectional majority.

The first of the series of acts by which the South was deprived of its due share of the territories, originated with the confederacy which preceded the existence of this Government. It is to be found in the provision of the ordinance of 1787. Its effect was to exclude the South entirely from that vast and fertile region which lies between the Ohio and the Mississippi rivers, now embracing five States and one territory. The next of the series is the Missouri compromise, which excluded the South from that large portion of Louisiana which lies north of $36^{\circ} 30'$, excepting what is included in the State of Missouri. The last of the series excluded the South from the whole of the Oregon Territory. All these, in the slang of the day, were what are called slave territories, and not free soil; that is, territories belonging to slaveholding powers and open to the emigration of masters with their slaves. By these several acts, the South was excluded from 1,238,025 square miles—an extent of country considerably exceeding the entire valley of the Mississippi. To the South was left the portion of the Territory of Louisiana lying south of $36^{\circ} 30'$, and the portion north of it included in the State of Missouri, with the portion lying south of $36^{\circ} 30'$, including the States of Louisiana and Arkansas, and the territory lying west of the latter, and south of $36^{\circ} 30'$, called the Indian country. These, with the Territory of Florida, now the State, make, in the whole, 283,503 square miles. To this must be added the territory acquired with Texas. If the whole should be added to the Southern section, it would make an increase of 325,520, which would make the whole left to the South, 609,023. But a large part of Texas is still in contest between the two sections, which leaves it uncertain what will be the real extent of the portion of territory that may be left to the South.

I have not included the territory recently acquired by the treaty with Mexico. The North is making the most strenuous efforts to appropriate the whole to herself, by excluding the South from every foot of it. If she should succeed, it will add to that from which the South has already been excluded, 526,078 square miles, and would increase

the whole which the North has appropriated to herself, to 1,764,023, not including the portion that she may succeed in excluding us from in Texas. To sum up the whole, the United States, since they declared their independence, have acquired 2,373,046 square miles of territory, from which the North will have excluded the South, if she should succeed in monopolizing the newly acquired territories, about three-fourths of the whole, leaving to the South but about one-fourth.

Such is the first and great cause that has destroyed the equilibrium between the two sections in the Government.

The next is the system of revenue and disbursements which has been adopted by the Government. It is well known that the Government has derived its revenue mainly from duties on imports. I shall not undertake to show that such duties must necessarily fall mainly on the exporting States, and that the South, as the great exporting portion of the Union, has in reality paid vastly more than her due proportion of the revenue; because I deem it unnecessary, as the subject has on so many occasions been fully discussed. Nor shall I, for the same reason, undertake to show that a far greater portion of the revenue has been disbursed at the North, than its due share; and that the joint effect of these causes has been, to transfer a vast amount from South to North, which, under an equal system of revenue and disbursements, would not have been lost to her. If to this be added, that many of the duties were imposed, not for revenue, but for protection,—that is, intended to put money, not in the treasury, but directly into the pocket of the manufacturers,—some conception may be formed of the immense amount which, in the long course of sixty years, has been transferred from South to North. There are no data by which it can be estimated with any certainty; but it is safe to say, that it amounts to hundreds of millions of dollars. Under the most moderate estimate, it would be sufficient to add greatly to the wealth of the North, and thus greatly increase her population by attracting emigration from all quarters to that section. . . .

But while these measures were destroying the equilibrium between the two sections, the action of the Government was leading to a radical change in its character, by concentrating all the power of the system in itself. . . .

That the Government claims, and practically maintains the right to decide in the last resort, as to the extent of its powers, will scarcely be denied by any one conversant with the political history of the country. That it also claims the right to resort to force to maintain whatever power it claims, against all opposition, is equally certain. Indeed it is apparent, from what we daily hear,

that this has become the prevailing and fixed opinion of a great majority of the community. Now, I ask, what limitation can possibly be placed upon the powers of a government claiming and exercising such rights? And, if none can be, how can the separate governments of the States maintain and protect the powers reserved to them by the constitution—or the people of the several States maintain those which are reserved to them, and among others, the sovereign powers by which they ordained and established, not only their separate State Constitutions and Governments, but also the Constitution and Government of the United States? But, if they have no constitutional means of maintaining them against the right claimed by this Government, it necessarily follows, that they hold them at its pleasure and discretion, and that all the powers of the system are in reality concentrated in it. It also follows, that the character of the Government has been changed in consequence, from a federal republic, as it originally came from the hands of its framers, into a great national consolidated democracy. It has indeed, at present, all the characteristics of the latter, and not one of the former, although it still retains its outward form.

[Calhoun then turns to the question of disunion, and offers an analysis of the process by which disunion would be brought about, and the steps which would accompany it.]

It is a great mistake to suppose that disunion can be effected by a single blow. The cords which bound these States together in one common Union, are far too numerous and powerful for that. Disunion must be the work of time. It is only through a long process, and successively, that the cords can be snapped, until the whole fabric falls asunder. Already the agitation of the slavery question has snapped some of the most important, and has greatly weakened all the others, as I shall proceed to show.

The cords that bind the States together are not only many, but various in character. Some are spiritual or ecclesiastical; some political; others social. Some appertain to the benefit conferred by the Union, and others to the feeling of duty and obligation.

The strongest of those of a spiritual and ecclesiastical nature, consisted in the unity of the great religious denominations, all of which originally embraced the whole Union. All these denominations, with the exception, perhaps, of the Catholics, were organized very much upon the principle of our political institutions. Beginning with smaller meetings, corresponding with the political divisions of the country, their organization terminated in one great central assemblage, corresponding very much with the character of Congress. At these meetings the principal clergymen

and lay members of the respective denominations, from all parts of the Union, met to transact business relating to their common concerns. It was not confined to what appertained to the doctrines and discipline of the respective denominations, but extended to plans for disseminating the Bible—establishing missions, distributing tracts—and of establishing presses for the publication of tracts, newspapers, and periodicals, with a view of diffusing religious information—and for the support of their respective doctrines and creeds. All this combined contributed greatly to strengthen the bonds of the Union. The ties which held each denomination together formed a strong cord to hold the whole Union together; but, powerful as they were, they have not been able to resist the explosive effect of slavery agitation.

The first of these cords which snapped, under its explosive force, was that of the powerful Methodist Episcopal Church. The numerous and strong ties which held it together, are all broken, and its unity gone. They now form separate churches; and, instead of that feeling of attachment and devotion to the interests of the whole church which was formerly felt, they are now arrayed into two hostile bodies, engaged in litigation about what was formerly their common property.

The next cord that snapped was that of the Baptists—one of the largest and most respectable of the denominations. That of the Presbyterian is not entirely snapped, but some of its strands have given way. That of the Episcopal Church is the only one of the four great Protestant denominations which remains unbroken and entire.

The strongest cord, of a political character, consists of the many and powerful ties that have held together the two great parties which have, with some modifications, existed from the beginning of the Government. They both extended to every portion of the Union, and strongly contributed to hold all its parts together. But this powerful cord has fared no better than the spiritual. It resisted, for a long time, the explosive tendency of the agitation, but has finally snapped under its force—if not entirely, in a great measure. Nor is there one of the remaining cords which has not been greatly weakened. To this extent the Union has already been destroyed by agitation, in the only way it can be, by sundering and weakening the cords which bind it together.

If the agitation goes on, the same force, acting with increased intensity, as has been shown, will finally snap every cord, when nothing will be left to hold the States together except force. But, surely, that can, with no propriety of language, be called a Union, when the only means by which the weaker is held connected with the stronger portion is *force*.

2. *Northern Democrats: Douglas.* In a speech at Chicago, October 23, 1850, Stephen A. Douglas, leader of the northern Democrats, defended his authorship of the bills to organize Utah and New Mexico without any Congressional restriction of slavery. The reporter who recorded Douglas's speech rendered part of it in direct quotation (first person) and part in indirect quotation (third person).²

These measures are predicated on the great fundamental principle that every people ought to possess the right of forming and regulating their own internal concerns and domestic institutions in their own way. It was supposed that those of our fellow-citizens who emigrated to the shores of the Pacific and to our other territories, were as capable of self-government as their neighbors and kindred whom they left behind them; and there was no reason for believing that they have lost any of their intelligence or patriotism by the wayside, while crossing the Isthmus or the Plains. It was also believed, that after their arrival in the country, when they had become familiar with its topography, climate, productions, and resources and had connected their destiny with it, they were fully as competent to judge for themselves what kind of laws and institutions were best adapted to their condition and interests, as we were who never saw the country, and knew very little about it. To question their competency to do this, was to deny their capacity for self-government. If they have the requisite intelligence and honesty to be intrusted with the enactment of laws for the government of white men, I know of no reason why they should not be deemed competent to legislate for the negro. If they are sufficiently enlightened to make laws for the protection of life, liberty, and property—of morals and education—to determine the relation of husband and wife—of parent and child—I am not aware that it requires any higher degree of civilization to regulate the affairs of master and servant. These things are all confided by the Constitution of each State to decide for itself, and I know of no reason why the same principle should not be extended to the Territories. . . . I believed then, and believe now, that it was better for the cause of freedom, of humanity, and of republicanism, to leave the people interested to settle all these questions for themselves. They have intellect and consciences as well as we, and have more interest in doing that which is best for themselves and their posterity, than we have as their self-constituted and officious guardians. I deem it fortunate for the peace and harmony of the country that Congress, taking the same view of the subject, rejected the Proviso, and passed the bills in the shape in which I originally re-

ported them. So far as slavery is concerned, I am sure that any man who will take the pains to examine the history of the question, will come to the conclusion that this is the true policy, as well as the sound republican doctrine. Mr. Douglas here went into a historical view of the subject, to show that slavery had never been excluded in fact from one inch of the American continent by act of Congress. When the federal Constitution was formed in '87, twelve of the thirteen States, then composing the Confederation, held slaves, and sustained the institution of slavery by their laws. Since that period slavery had been abolished in six of these twelve original slave States. How was this effected? Not by an act of Congress. Not by the interposition of the Federal Government. Congress had no power over the subject, and never attempted to interfere with it. Slavery was abolished in those States by the people of each, acting for themselves, and upon their own motion and responsibility. The people became convinced that it was for their own interests, and the interests of their posterity, pecuniarily and morally, and they did it of their own free will, and rigidly enforced their own laws.

So it was in the territory northwest of the Ohio River. By the act of Congress, known as the Ordinance of '87, slavery was prohibited by law, but not excluded *in fact*. Slavery existed in the Territories of Illinois and Indiana, in spite of the Ordinance, under the authority of the Territorial laws. Illinois was a slaveholding Territory in defiance of the act of Congress, but became a free State by the action of our own people, when they framed our State constitution, preparatory to their admission into the Union. So it was with Indiana. Oregon prohibited slavery by the action of her people under their provisional government, several years before Congress established a Territorial government. In short, wherever slavery has been excluded, and free institutions established, it has been done by the voluntary action of the people interested. Wherever Congress attempted to interfere in opposition to the wishes of the people of the Territory, its enactments remained a dead letter upon the statute-book, and the people took such legislative action as comported with their inclinations and supposed interests.

3. *Northern Whigs: Webster.* Most anti-slavery men took the position that Congress ought to exclude slavery from the whole of the Mexican Cession, but a few held that the whole territorial question was in a measure fictitious and that the antislavery goal could be achieved without any specific act of Congress. This view was ably stated in a famous Senate speech by Daniel Webster on March 7, 1850.³ Historians regard this as one of Webster's most weighty speeches, but at the time, anti-slavery critics assailed it bitterly.

Now, as to California and New Mexico, I hold slavery to be excluded from those territories by a law even superior to that which admits and sanctions it in Texas. I mean the law of nature, of physical geography, the law of the formation of the earth. That law settles for ever, with a strength beyond all terms of human enactment, that slavery cannot exist in California or New Mexico. Understand me, Sir; I mean slavery as we regard it; the slavery of the colored race as it exists in the Southern States. I shall not discuss the point, but leave it to the learned gentlemen who have undertaken to discuss it; but I suppose there is no slavery of that description in California now. I understand that *peonism*, a sort of penal servitude, exists there, or rather a sort of voluntary sale of a man and his offspring for debt, an arrangement of a peculiar nature known to the law of Mexico. But what I mean to say is, that it is as impossible that African slavery, as we see it among us, should find its way, or be introduced, into California and New Mexico, as any other natural impossibility. California and New Mexico are Asiatic in their formation and scenery. They are composed of vast ridges of mountains, of great height, with broken ridges and deep valleys. The sides of these mountains are entirely barren; their tops capped by perennial snow. There may be in California, now made free by its own constitution, and no doubt there are, some tracts of valuable land. But it is not so in New Mexico. . . . What is there in New Mexico that could, by any possibility, induce any body to go there with slaves? There are some narrow strips of tillable land on the borders of the rivers; but the rivers themselves dry up before midsummer is gone. All that the people can do in that region is to raise some little articles, some little wheat for their *tortillas*, and that by irrigation. And who expects to see a hundred black men cultivating tobacco, corn, cotton, rice, or any thing else, on lands in New Mexico, made fertile only by irrigation?

I look upon it, therefore, as a fixed fact, to use the current expression of the day, that both California and New Mexico are destined to be free, . . . free by the arrangement of things ordained by the Power above us. I have therefore to say, in this respect also, that this country is fixed for freedom, to as many persons as shall ever live in it, by a less repealable law than that which attaches to the right of holding slaves in Texas; and I will say further, that, if a resolution or a bill were now before us, to provide a territorial government for New Mexico, I would not vote to put any prohibition into it whatever. Such a prohibition would be idle, as it respects any effect it would have upon the territory; and I would not take pains uselessly to reaffirm an ordinance of nature, nor to reenact the will of

God. I would put in no Wilmot Proviso for the mere purpose of a taunt or a reproach. I would put into it no evidence of the votes of superior power, exercised for no purpose but to wound the pride, whether a just and a rational pride, or an irrational pride, of the citizens of the Southern States. . . .

Sir, if we were now making a government for New Mexico, and any body should propose a Wilmot Proviso, I should treat it exactly as Mr. Polk treated that provision for excluding slavery from Oregon. Mr. Polk was known to be in opinion decidedly averse to the Wilmot Proviso; but he felt the necessity of establishing a government for the Territory of Oregon. The proviso was in the bill, but he knew it would be entirely nugatory; and, since it must be entirely nugatory, since it took away no right, no describable, no tangible, no appreciable right of the South, he said he would sign the bill for the sake of enacting a law to form a government in that Territory, and let that entirely useless, and, in that connection, entirely senseless, proviso remain. Sir, we hear occasionally of the annexation of Canada; and if there be any man, any of the Northern Democracy, or any one of the Free Soil party, who supposes it necessary to insert a Wilmot Proviso in a territorial government for New Mexico, that man would of course be of opinion that it is necessary to protect the everlasting snows of Canada from the foot of slavery by the same overspreading wing of an act of Congress. Sir, wherever there is a substantive good to be done, wherever there is a foot of land to be prevented from becoming slave territory, I am ready to assert the principle of the exclusion of slavery. I am pledged to it from the year 1837; I have been pledged to it again and again; and I will perform those pledges; but I will not do a thing unnecessarily that wounds the feelings of others, or that does discredit to my own understanding.

4. *Northern Whigs: Seward.* One of the principal spokesmen of the group that supported the Wilmot Proviso was William H. Seward of New York. Seward stated his position in a Senate speech on March 11, 1850.⁴

It is now avowed by the honorable senator from South Carolina, [Mr. CALHOUN,] that nothing will satisfy the slave states but a compromise that will convince them that they can remain in the Union consistently with their honor and their safety. And what are the concessions which will have that effect? Here they are, in the words of that senator:

"The north must do justice by conceding to the south an equal right in the acquired territory, and do her duty by causing the stipulations relative to fugitive slaves to be faithfully fulfilled—cease the agitation of the slave question, and provide for

the insertion of a provision in the Constitution, by an amendment, which will restore to the south in substance the power she possessed, of protecting herself, before the equilibrium between the sections was destroyed by the action of this government."

These terms amount to this: that the free states having already, or although they may hereafter have, majorities of population, and majorities in both houses of Congress, shall concede to the slave states, being in a minority in both, the unequal advantage of an equality. That is, that we shall alter the Constitution so as to convert the Government from a national democracy, operating by a constitutional majority of voices, into a federal alliance, in which the minority shall have a veto against the majority. And this would be nothing less than to return to the original Articles of Confederation.

But there is yet another aspect in which this principle must be examined. It regards the domain only as a possession, to be enjoyed either in common or by partition by the citizens of the old states. It is true, indeed, that the national domain is ours. It is true it was acquired by the valor and with the wealth of the whole nation. But we hold, nevertheless, no arbitrary power over it. We hold no arbitrary authority over anything, whether acquired lawfully or seized by usurpation. The Constitution regulates our stewardship; the Constitution devotes the domain to union, to justice, to defence, to welfare, and to liberty.

But there is a higher law than the Constitution, which regulates our authority over the domain, and devotes it to the same noble purposes. The territory is a part, no inconsiderable part, of the common heritage of mankind, bestowed upon them by the Creator of the universe. We are his stewards, and must so discharge our trust as to secure in the highest attainable degree their happiness. . . .

This is a state, and we are deliberating for it, just as our fathers deliberated in establishing the institutions we enjoy. Whatever superiority there is in our condition and hopes over those of any other "kingdom" or "estate," is due to the fortunate circumstance that our ancestors did not leave things to "take their chance," but that they "added amplitude and greatness" to our commonwealth "by introducing such ordinances, constitutions, and customs, as were wise." We in our turn have succeeded to the same responsibilities, and we cannot approach the duty before us wisely or justly, except we raise ourselves to the great consideration of how we can most certainly "sow greatness to our posterity and successors."

And now the simple, bold, and even awful question which presents itself to us is this: Shall we, who are founding institutions, social and political,

for countless millions; shall we, who know by experience the wise and the just, and are free to choose them, and to reject the erroneous and unjust; shall we establish human bondage, or permit it by our sufferance to be established? Sir, our forefathers would not have hesitated an hour. They found slavery existing here, and they left it only because they could not remove it. There is not only no free state which would now establish it, but there is no slave state, which, if it had had the free alternative as we now have, would have founded slavery. Indeed, our revolutionary predecessors had precisely the same question before them in establishing an organic law under which the states of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin, have since come into the Union, and they solemnly repudiated and excluded slavery from those states forever. I confess that the most alarming evidence of our degeneracy which has yet been given is found in the fact that we even debate such a question. . . .

The next of this class of arguments is, that the inhibition of slavery in the new territories is *unnecessary*; . . . But why is it unnecessary? It is said, *first*, by reason of *climate*. I answer, if this be so, why do not the representatives of the slave states concede the Proviso? They deny that the climate prevents the introduction of slavery. Then I will leave nothing to a contingency. But, in truth, I think the weight of argument is against the proposition. Is there any climate where slavery has not existed? It has prevailed all over Europe, from sunny Italy to bleak England, and is existing now, stronger than in any other land, in ice-bound Russia. But it will be replied, that this is not African slavery. I rejoin, that only makes the case the stronger. If this vigorous Saxon race of ours was reduced to slavery while it retained the courage of semi-barbarism in its own high northern latitude, what security does climate afford against the transplantation of the more gentle, more docile, and already enslaved and debased African to the genial climate of New Mexico and Eastern California?

Sir, there is no climate uncongenial to slavery. It is true it is less productive than free labor in many northern countries. But so it is less productive than free white labor in even tropical climates. Labor is in quick demand in all new countries. Slave labor is cheaper than free labor, and it would go first into new regions; and wherever it goes it brings labor into dishonor, and therefore free white labor avoids competition with it. Sir, I might rely on climate if I had not been born in a land where slavery existed—and this land was all of it north of the fortieth parallel of latitude; and if I did not know the struggle it has cost, and which is yet going on, to get complete relief from the institution and its baleful consequences. I desire to propound this question to those who are now in favor

of dispensing with the Wilmot Proviso: Was the ordinance of 1787 necessary or not? Necessary, we all agree. It has received too many elaborate eulogiums to be now decried as an idle and superfluous thing. And yet that ordinance extended the inhibition of slavery from the thirty-seventh to the fortieth parallel of north latitude. And now

we are told that the inhibition named is unnecessary anywhere north of 36° 30'! We are told that we may rely upon the laws of God, which prohibit slave labor north of that line, and that it is absurd to re-enact the laws of God. Sir, there is no human enactment which is just that is not a re-enactment of the law of God.

B. FACTORS OF DISRUPTION: THE FUGITIVE SLAVE QUESTION

In 1852 the Democratic party ran Franklin Pierce for the Presidency on a platform that stressed the “finality” of the Compromise of 1850. Pierce won easily over his Whig opponent, carrying all but four states. So far as election returns were an indication, therefore, the slavery question had found a solution at least in the political sphere.

But despite the pacific appearance of affairs, the next nine years witnessed ever more intense struggles over slavery. These struggles centered around the reopening of the territorial issue and the question of fugitive slaves—a topic surcharged with emotion.

In proportion to the population of slaves in the United States, the number of runaways was never very large. In 1850, for instance, when the slave population exceeded 3,000,000, the number of escaped slaves amounted to 1030, and of this number more than half came from Maryland, Kentucky, Virginia, and Missouri. These border states whose losses were heaviest seldom complained bitterly; the loudest outcries in Congress came from those states of the lower South which lost fewest slaves.

Like the territorial question, therefore, the fugitive-slave question actually concerned very few slaves, but it assumed major emotional significance because it involved an obligation on the free states to send men back to slavery. Of all Constitutional obligations this was to the South the clearest; to the North, the most offensive. Men who were otherwise the most law-abiding citizens and the most scrupulous in their regard for property rights proudly violated the fugitive slave laws and assisted slaves to run away from their owners. As early as 1843 the northern states began to pass laws to prevent any state cooperation in the recovery of fugitives. The South reacted to this by demanding an excessively severe fugitive slave law in 1850. The selections illustrate typical personal liberty laws of the states, the legal character of the Act of 1850, the legal resistance to its enforcement, and the type of situation that arose in several famous cases under the act.

1. *Massachusetts Liberty Laws.* In 1842, in the case of *Prigg v. Pennsylvania*, the Supreme Court expressed doubt as to whether the states were legally obligated to assist in the recovery of fugitives, the implication being that federal officials held full responsibility. Several northern states at once took up this suggestion and passed laws on the subject. The law of Massachusetts, adopted March 24, 1843, is a characteristic specimen of this legislation. The reader should understand that this law applies exclusively to state officials and does not in any way touch the activities of federal officials.⁵

Sect. 1. No judge of any court of record of this Commonwealth, and no justice of the peace, shall hereafter take cognizance or grant a certificate in cases that may arise under the third section of an act of Congress, passed February twelfth, seventeen hundred and ninety-three, and entitled “an act respecting fugitives from justice and persons es-

caping from the service of their masters,” to any person who claims any other person as a fugitive slave within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth.

Sect. 2. No sheriff, deputy sheriff, coroner, constable, jailer, or other officer of this Commonwealth, shall hereafter arrest or detain, or aid in the arrest or detention or imprisonment in any jail or other building belonging to this Commonwealth, or to any county, city or town thereof, of any person for the reason that he is claimed as a fugitive slave.

Sect. 3. Any justice of the peace, sheriff, deputy sheriff, coroner, constable, or jailer, who shall offend against the provisions of this law, by in any way acting directly or indirectly under the power conferred by the third section of the act of Congress aforementioned, shall forfeit a sum not exceeding one thousand dollars for every such offence, to the use of the county where said offence is committed, or shall be subject to imprisonment not exceeding one year in the county jail.

2. *The Fugitive Slave Act.* The Compromise of 1850 included a new fugitive slave act to replace the original act of 1793. The text of this new measure will show why critics condemned it as an unfair measure that did not provide just procedure for determining whether a defendant under the act was slave or free.⁶

Sec. 5. . . . That it shall be the duty of all marshals and deputy marshals to obey and execute all warrants and precepts issued under the provisions of this act, when to them directed; and should any marshal or deputy marshal refuse to receive such warrant, or other process, when tendered, or to use all proper means diligently to execute the same, he shall, on conviction thereof, be fined in the sum of one thousand dollars, to the use of such claimant, . . . and after arrest of such fugitive, by such marshal or his deputy, or whilst at any time in his custody under the provisions of this act, should such fugitive escape, whether with or without the assent of such marshal or his deputy, such marshal shall be liable, on his official bond, to be prosecuted for the benefit of such claimant, for the full value of the service or labor of said fugitive in the State, Territory, or District whence he escaped: and the better to enable the said commissioners, when thus appointed, to execute their duties faithfully and efficiently, in conformity with the requirements of the Constitution of the United States and of this act, they are hereby authorized and empowered, within their counties respectively, to appoint, . . . any one or more suitable persons, from time to time, to execute all such warrants and other process as may be issued by them in the lawful performance of their respective duties; with authority to such commissioners, or the persons to be appointed by them, to execute process as aforesaid, to summon and call to their aid the bystanders, or *posse comitatus* of the proper county, when necessary to ensure a faithful observance of the clause of the Constitution referred to, in conformity with the provisions of this act; and all good citizens are hereby commanded to aid and assist in the prompt and efficient execution of this law, whenever their services may be required, as aforesaid, for that purpose; and said warrants shall run, and be executed by said officers, any where in the State within which they are issued.

Sec. 5. . . . That when a person held to service or labor in any State or Territory of the United States, has heretofore or shall hereafter escape into another State or Territory of the United States, the person or persons to whom such service or labor may be due, . . . may pursue and reclaim such fugitive person, either by procuring a warrant from some one of the courts, judges, or com-

missioners aforesaid, of the proper circuit, district, or county, for the apprehension of such fugitive from service or labor, or by seizing and arresting such fugitive, where the same can be done without process, and by taking, or causing such person to be taken, forthwith before such court, judge, or commissioner, whose duty it shall be to hear and determine the case of such claimant in a summary manner; and upon satisfactory proof being made, by deposition or affidavit, in writing, to be taken and certified by such court, judge, or commissioner, or by other satisfactory testimony, duly taken and certified by some court, . . . and with proof, also by affidavit, of the identity of the person whose service or labor is claimed to be due as aforesaid, that the person so arrested does in fact owe service or labor to the person or persons claiming him or her, in the State or Territory from which such fugitive may have escaped as aforesaid, and that said person escaped, to make out and deliver to such claimant, his or her agent or attorney, a certificate setting forth the substantial facts as to the service or labor due from such fugitive to the claimant, and of his or her escape from the State or Territory in which such service or labor was due, to the State or Territory in which he or she was arrested, with authority to such claimant, . . . to use such reasonable force and restraint as may be necessary, under the circumstances of the case, to take and remove such fugitive person back to the State or Territory whence he or she may have escaped as aforesaid. In no trial or hearing under this act shall the testimony of such alleged fugitive be admitted in evidence; and the certificates in this and the first [fourth] section mentioned, shall be conclusive of the right of the person or persons in whose favor granted, to remove such fugitive to the State or Territory from which he escaped, and shall prevent all molestation of such person or persons by any process issued by any court, judge, magistrate, or other person whomsoever.

Sec. 7. . . . That any persons who shall knowingly and willingly obstruct, hinder, or prevent such claimant, his agent or attorney, or any person or persons lawfully assisting him, her, or them, from arresting such a fugitive from service or labor, either with or without process as aforesaid, or shall rescue, or attempt to rescue, such fugitive from service or labor, from the custody of such claimant, . . . or other person or persons lawfully assisting as aforesaid, when so arrested, . . . or shall aid, abet, or assist such person so owing service or labor as aforesaid, directly or indirectly, to escape from such claimant, . . . or shall harbor or conceal such fugitive, so as to prevent the discovery and arrest of such person, after notice or knowledge of the fact that such person was a fugitive from service or labor . . . shall, for

either of said offences, be subject to a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars, and imprisonment not exceeding six months . . . ; and shall moreover forfeit and pay, by way of civil damages to the party injured by such illegal conduct, the sum of one thousand dollars, for each fugitive so lost as aforesaid. . . .

Sec. 8. . . . That the marshals, their deputies, and the clerks of the . . . District and Territorial Courts, shall be paid, for their services, the like fees as may be allowed to them for similar services in other cases; and where such services are rendered exclusively in the arrest, custody, and delivery of the fugitive to the claimant, his or her agent or attorney, or where such supposed fugitive may be discharged out of custody for the want of sufficient proof as aforesaid, then such fees are to be paid in the whole by such claimant . . . ; and in all cases where the proceedings are before a commissioner, he shall be entitled to a fee of ten dollars in full for his services in each case, upon the delivery of the said certificate to the claimant, his or her agent or attorney; or a fee of five dollars in cases where the proof shall not, in the opinion of such commissioner, warrant such certificate and delivery, inclusive of all services incident to such arrest and examination, to be paid, in either case, by the claimant, his or her agent or attorney.

3. *State versus Federal Courts.* The emphatic provisions of the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 utterly failed to secure compliance in the northern States. In many cases citizens resisted, and in a number of cases state courts obstructed the enforcement of the law. In 1855 the Ohio courts set free a Negro whom the United States marshal was holding for trial under the Fugitive Slave Act, and when the marshal rearrested his prisoner the Ohio court arrested the marshal. It required the action of a federal court to set the marshal free. In 1859 another outstanding case arose in Wisconsin. Here an Abolitionist editor, Sherman M. Booth, was arrested for aiding a fugitive in escaping from a United States marshal. Booth was held in a local jail since no federal jail was available. He applied to a state court for a writ of habeas corpus; the court set him free, and its action was upheld on appeal to the state supreme court. Meanwhile, the case in connection with which Booth had originally been held was brought to trial in the federal district court at Milwaukee. He was convicted, sentenced, and imprisoned for violating the Fugitive Slave Law. Again, for lack of a federal jail, he was sent to a state prison, and again he appealed to the state courts. The Supreme Court of Wisconsin

thereupon ordered him to be set free for a second time—and this after he had been tried by a federal court and was serving a formal sentence. When the case was brought to the Supreme Court of the United States the action of the Wisconsin court was overruled, and Chief Justice Taney, in giving the opinion, delivered some comments on the transactions that had occurred.⁷

It will be seen, from the foregoing statement of facts, that a judge of the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, in the first of these cases, claimed and exercised the right to supervise and annul the proceedings of a commissioner of the United States, and to discharge a prisoner, who had been committed by the commissioner for an offense against the laws of this Government, and that this exercise of power by the judge was afterwards sanctioned and affirmed by the Supreme Court of the State.

In the second case, the State court has gone a step further, and . . . have not only claimed and exercised this jurisdiction, but have also determined that their decision is final and conclusive upon all the courts of the United States, and ordered their clerk to disregard and refuse obedience to the writ of error issued by this court, pursuant to the act of Congress of 1789, to bring here for examination and revision the judgment of the State court.

These propositions are new in the jurisprudence of the United States, as well as of the States; and the supremacy of the State courts over the courts of the United States, in cases arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States, is now for the first time asserted and acted upon in the Supreme Court of a State. . . .

If the judicial power exercised in this instance has been reserved to the States, no offence against the laws of the United States can be punished by their own courts, without the permission and according to the judgment of the courts of the State in which the party happens to be imprisoned; for, if the Supreme Court of Wisconsin possessed the power it has exercised in relation to offences against the act of Congress in question, it necessarily follows that they must have the same judicial authority in relation to any other law of the United States; and, consequently, their supervising and controlling power would embrace the whole criminal code of the United States, and extend to offences against our revenue laws, or any other law intended to guard the different departments of the General Government from fraud or violence. And it would embrace all crimes, from the highest to the lowest; including felonies, which are punished with death, as well as misdemeanours, which are punished by imprisonment.

4. *Anthony Burns*. There were a number of famous fugitive slave cases. One of the most celebrated was that of Anthony Burns, a Virginia Negro who had escaped to Boston. A full account of the Burns case was written by Charles E. Stevens who witnessed many of the events connected with it and who verified his other facts by a careful questioning of participants and witnesses.⁸

[*The Arrest*]

In the evening of the twenty-fourth of May, 1854, Anthony Burns was arrested as a fugitive slave in the heart of Boston. He had been employed, during the day, in a clothing store situated in Brattle street, and belonging to Coffin Pitts, a respectable colored trader. The locality was peculiarly suggestive of liberty and human rights. In full view, at the distance of only three or four rods, stands Brattle street Church, imbedded in the front face of which is a cannon-ball, preserved as a sacred memento of the Siege of Boston. A little farther off, but also in full view, stands Faneuil Hall. The street itself, an ancient one, perpetuates the name of one of the most enlightened friends of liberty that in the early days assisted in building up the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. In this favored locality Burns had passed exactly one month of quiet freedom, spent in honest industry, when the sudden interruption of his happiness took place.

The arrest was made under a warrant issued on the same day, by Edward G. Loring, a United States Commissioner. The person charged with its immediate execution was a man who had already become infamous by making the hunting of fugitive slaves his special vocation. The name of this man was Asa O. Butman. He had been observed in the store of Mr. Pitts during the day; but, although he was seen more than once to fix his eye upon Burns, no suspicion had been excited by his appearance. Not dreaming of danger, Burns kept about his business until the hour of closing the shop arrived, when he locked the door and departed. It had been his constant custom to accompany his employer, with whom he boarded, directly home; but on the evening in question he took it into his head, from mere caprice, to stroll down the street in an opposite direction. Mr. Pitts meanwhile pursued his way homeward. After going on aimlessly for a few rods, Burns retraced his steps, intending to overtake his employer, who, at that moment, was disappearing round the corner of Brattle and Court streets. Apprehending nothing, he went leisurely along until, just as he had reached the corner of Hanover and Court streets, a hand was roughly laid on his shoulder, and an exclamation of, "Stop, old boy!" arrested his steps.

On turning, he found himself in the grasp of Butman. Still unsuspecting of the real state of the case, and supposing that he had been beset only by a street brawler, he demanded to know why he was detained. Butman informed him that he was arrested on a charge of having broken into and robbed a jewelry-store. Conscious of innocence, and feeling assured that he could easily clear himself of the charge, Burns made no resistance, and did not even alarm his employer, who was then only two or three rods in advance. The spot where the arrest was made, was hard by Peter B. Brigham's drinking-saloon, the most noted establishment of the kind in Boston. From that, or from some other lurking-place in the vicinity, six or seven men immediately rushed forth to the assistance of the officer. Encircling the prisoner, they in a moment had him off his feet, took him in their arms horizontally as they would a dead person, and, avoiding the side-walk, rapidly bore him down the middle of the street to the Court House. At the entrance, they were received by the United States Marshal, who stood with a drawn sword upon the outer steps, manifestly awaiting their appearance. Without pause, or being set down upon his feet, the prisoner was hurried up several flights of stairs to the United States jury-room, near the top of the building. He had been informed, on being arrested, that he was to be conducted into the presence of the person whom he was accused of robbing. Finding no such person present, he now demanded to know why the jeweller did not come. Butman and his associates professed wonder at his non-appearance. The delay continued. Suddenly, the truth flashed upon the unhappy prisoner—he was an arrested fugitive slave! Then, with the quickness of thought, the whole dismal future opened up before his mental vision. As in a dissolving view, the land of freedom faded out, and the dark land of slavery usurped its place. He saw himself again a slave; far worse than that, a slave disgraced; pointed at as a runaway; punished; perhaps punished unto death. Overpowered by the prospect, he, in his own simple but expressive phrase, "gave all up." Fast confined within granite walls, and closely guarded by eight armed men, he saw the full hopelessness of his situation, and did not for a moment indulge any thought of escape.

Twenty minutes had elapsed, when the door was thrown open, and the Marshal, accompanied by two men, entered the room. The men were Charles F. Suttle, the claimant of Burns, and his agent, William Brent; Virginians both. Immediately stepping toward the prisoner, Mr. Suttle, with mock politeness, took off his hat, saluted the latter with a low bow, and said, with emphasis on the appellation:

"How do you do, Mr. Burns?"

The prisoner had no reply for this unseemly triumph over his blasted hopes.

"Why did you run away from me?" pursued Suttle.

"I fell asleep on board the vessel where I worked, and, before I woke up, she set sail and carried me off."

"Haven't I always treated you well, Tony?"

To this question Burns made no answer.

"Haven't I always given you money when you needed?"

"You have always given me twelve and a half-cents once a year."

Nothing further passed between the two, but in this brief colloquy Burns had already made admissions decisive of his fate. While it was going on, Brent stood gazing steadily in the prisoner's face, but exchanged no words, not even salutations with him. The object of the wily slaveholder had been accomplished, and with his friend he now took his departure. As he passed out, the Marshal put the inquiry, "Well, that's the man, is it?" to which Suttle responded, "Yes."

[Plan of the Abolitionist Groups to Prevent Burns's Master from Recovering Him]

By this Committee of Vigilance, the case of Burns was now taken in hand. Early in the afternoon of the day following his arrest, a full meeting for the purpose was secretly convened. On the main point there was but one voice; all agreed that, be the Commissioner's decision what it might, Burns should never be taken back to Virginia, if it were in their power to prevent. But there were two opinions as to the method by which they should proceed to effect their purpose. One party counselled an attack on the Court House, and a forcible rescue of the prisoner. The other party were in favor of a less violent course. They proposed to await the Commissioner's decision; then, if it were adverse to the prisoner, they would crowd the streets when he was brought forth, present an impassable living barrier to the progress of the escort, and see to it that, in the *melee* which would inevitably follow, Burns made good his escape. Both plans were long and vehemently debated, but, without arriving at any decision, the meeting was adjourned till evening. At this second session, the more peaceful method prevailed by a very large majority. For the purpose of arousing the popular feeling to the requisite pitch and also indicating to the public the particular line of action which had been chosen, it was at the same time decided to call a public meeting in Faneuil Hall for the evening following. Another step was, to detail a certain number of men to watch the Court House, night and day, lest the prisoner should be removed unawares. . . .

The advocates for an assault on the Court

House, though outvoted, were not to be beaten off from their purpose. At the close of the evening meeting, a voice loudly called upon all who were in favor of that mode of action, to tarry after the rest had retired. Fifteen or twenty persons responded to this call; but when it was proposed that they should pledge themselves in writing to engage with force and arms in the perilous enterprise, only seven of the number had the courage to affix their signatures to the agreement. Not dismayed by such severe sifting, these seven still resolved to go forward; and the following night—the night for the meeting in Faneuil Hall—was fixed upon for the execution of their plan.

[At the meeting at Faneuil Hall, Theodore Parker addressed a large crowd in terms which seemed designed to incite violent action. He spoke of the fact that in Revolutionary days supporters of the Act would have been tarred and feathered; he declared that peace was not always the means to attain liberty; and he ridiculed mere discussion, crying, "Are we to have *deeds* as well as words?" When it became clear that the crowd desired to storm the jail, however, Parker sought to dissuade them, and order was being restored when a man appeared at the entrance to the hall and shouted "Mr. Chairman, I am just informed that a mob of negroes is in Court Square attempting to rescue Burns. I move that we adjourn to Court Square." At this the audience rushed away pell-mell to the place of Burns's imprisonment.]

It is necessary to return and follow the movements of the little band that had pledged themselves to the forcible rescue of Burns. A place of rendezvous had been appointed, but when the time for meeting arrived, only six of the seven appeared. The defection of their faint-hearted companion did not shake the purpose of the rest. Feeling, however, that their number was too small, they agreed to go forth, and, if possible, secure each man six coadjutors. This effort was so successful that in a short time the number of confederates was increased to nearly twenty-five. Their weapons of attack were various; some were armed with revolvers, some carried axes, and some butcher's cleavers that had just been purchased and were left in their paper coverings for better concealment. In a passage-way hard by, a large stick of timber had been secretly deposited to serve as a battering-ram. Soon after nine o'clock, everything was ready for the assault. It was at this juncture that the alarm had been given to the meeting in Faneuil Hall.

Scarcely had the crowd from the Hall begun to pour into the Square when the assault was commenced. The lamps that lighted the Square had already been extinguished, so that under cover of darkness the assailants might more easily escape detection. Strangely neglecting the eastern en-

trance, which was not secured at the time, they passed round to the west side and commenced the attack in that quarter. The Court House on that side presented to the eye an unbroken façade of granite two hundred feet long and four stories high. In the lower part were three entrances, closed by massive two-leaved doors which were secured by heavy locks and bolts. Against the middle one of these doors, the beam which had been previously provided, was now brought to bear with all the force that ten or twelve men could muster. At the same moment, one or two others plied their axes against the panels. As the quick, heavy blows resounded through the Square, the crowd, every moment rapidly increasing, sent up their wild shouts of encouragement, while some hurled missiles against the windows, and others discharged their pistols in the same direction. In two or three minutes, a panel in one part of the door had been beaten through; the other part had been partially forced back on its hinges, when the assailants found their entrance obstructed by defenders within. The Marshal, whose office was in the building, although not anticipating the attack, was not altogether unprepared for it. In the course of the day, he had appointed fifty special aides, and posted them in different parts of the spacious building; he had also caused to be deposited in his office a large quantity of cutlasses. On the first alarm, the specials were hastily armed with these weapons and set to defend the assaulted door. As often as the pressure from without forced it partially open, it was closed again and braced by the persons of those inside. While thus engaged, one of the Marshal's men, a truckman named Batchelder, suddenly drew back from the door, exclaiming that he was stabbed. He was carried into the Marshal's office and laid upon the floor, where he almost immediately expired. It was discovered that a wound, several inches in length, had been inflicted by some sharp instrument in the lower part of his abdomen, whereby an artery had been severed, causing him to bleed to death. A conflict of opinion afterward arose respecting the source from whence the blow proceeded. Some affirmed that it was an accident caused by one of his own party. It was said that Batchelder was engaged at the moment in bracing one part of the door with his shoulders; that while he was in that half-stooping posture, another of the specials, seeing through the opening the hands of one of the assailants, aimed at them a blow with a watchman's club, which, missing its mark, fell upon the head of Batchelder and drove him down upon the blade of his own cutlass. Another, and perhaps more probable account was, that while Batchelder stood bracing the door behind the broken panel, the wound was inflicted by an arm thrust through from the outside, not with

any murderous intent, but to compel him to relax his hold.

[The assault on the prison failed. A trial was held, and the court decided that Burns was a fugitive from his master Suttle which, in fact, no one had ever denied. When he was carried away from Boston, however, great precautions were taken to guard against any attempt at rescue. Both state militia and federal troops were employed.]

At eleven o'clock, Court Square presented a spectacle that became indelibly engraved upon the memories of men. The people had been swept out of the Square, and stood crowded together in Court street, presenting to the eye a solid rampart of living beings. At the eastern door of the Court House, stood the cannon, loaded, with its mouth pointed full upon the compact mass. By its side stood the officer commanding the detachment of United States troops, gazing with steady composure in the same direction. It was the first time that the armed power of the United States had ever been arrayed against the people of Massachusetts. Men who witnessed the sight, and reflected upon its cause, were made painfully to recognize the fact, before unfelt, that they were the subjects of two governments. . . .

At length, about two o'clock, the column was formed in the Square. First came a detachment of United States Artillery, followed by a platoon of United States Marines. After these followed the armed civil posse of the Marshal, to which succeeded two platoons of Marines. The cannon, guarded by another platoon of Marines, brought up the rear. When this arrangement was completed, Burns, accompanied by an officer on each side with arms interlocked, was conducted from his prison through a passage lined with soldiers, and placed in the centre of the armed posse. Immediately after the decision, Mr. Dana and Mr. Grimes had asked permission to walk with Burns arm in arm, from the Court House to the vessel at the wharf; and the Marshal had given them his consent. At the last moment, he sought them out and requested that they would not insist upon the performance of his promise, because, in the opinion of some of the military officers, such a spectacle would add to the excitement. Mr. Dana declined to release the Marshal from his promise. The latter persisted in urging the abandonment of the purpose.

"Do I understand you," asked Mr. Dana, "to say distinctly that we *shall not* accompany Burns, after having giving your promise that we might?"

The Marshal winced under the pressure of this pointed question, but after a momentary reluctance answered firmly, "Yes." Accordingly, without a single friend at his side, and hemmed in by a thick-set hedge of gleaming blades, Burns took his departure.

The route from the Court House to the wharf had by this time become thronged with a countless multitude. It seemed as if the whole population of the city had been concentrated upon this narrow space. In vain the military and police had attempted to clear the streets; the carriage-way alone was kept vacant. On the sidewalks in Court and State streets, every available spot was occupied; all the passages, windows, and balconies, from basement to attic, overflowed with gazers, while the roofs of the buildings were black with human beings. It was computed that not less than fifty thousand people had gathered to witness the spectacle.

At different points along the route, were displayed symbols significant of the prevailing sentiment. A distinguished member of the Suffolk Bar, whose office was directly opposite the courtroom, and who was, at the time, commander of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery, draped his windows in mourning. The example was quickly followed by others. From a window opposite the Old State House, was suspended a black coffin, upon which was the legend, *The Funeral of Liberty*. At a point farther on toward the wharf, a venerable merchant had caused a rope to be stretched from his own warehouse across State street to an opposite point, and the American flag, draped in mourning, to be suspended therefrom with the union down. . . .

Along this Via Dolorosa, with its cloud of witnesses, the column now began to move. No music enlivened its march; the dull tramp of the soldiers on the rocky pavements, and the groans and hisses of the bystanders, were the only sounds. As it proceeded, its numbers were swelled by unexpected additions. Unauthorized, the zealous commander of the mounted Dragoons joined it with his corps. The Lancers, jealous of their rivals, hastened to follow the example: thus vanguard and rear-guard consisted of Massachusetts troops. In its progress, it went past the Old State House, . . . Just below, it passed over the ground where, in the Massacre of 1770, fell Attucks, the first

negro martyr in the cause of American liberty.

Opposite the Custom House, the column turned at a right angle into another street. This cross movement suddenly checked the long line of spectators which had been pressing down State street, parallel with the other body; but the rear portion, not understanding the nature of the obstruction, continued to press forward, and forced the front from the sidewalk into the middle of the Street. To the chafed and watchful military, this movement wore the aspect of an assault on the *cortege*; instantly some Lancers, stationed near, rode their horses furiously at the surging crowd, and hacked with their sabres upon the defenceless heads within their reach. Immediately after, a detachment of infantry charged upon the dense mass, at a run, with fixed bayonets. Some were pitched headlong down the cellar-ways, some were forced into the passages, and up flights of stairs, and others were overthrown upon the pavement, bruised and wounded.

While this was passing, the procession moved on and reached the wharf. A breach of trust had secured to the Federal authorities the use of this wharf for their present purpose. It was the property of a company, by whom it had been committed in charge to an agent. Without their knowledge and against their wishes, he had granted to the Marshal its use on this occasion. When arraigned afterward by his employers for such betrayal of trust, he replied that he had since been rewarded by an appointment to a place in the Custom House.

At the end of the wharf lay a small steamer which had been chartered by the United States Government. On board this vessel Burns was conducted by the Marshal, and immediately withdrawn from the sight of the gazing thousands into the cabin below. The United States troops followed, and, after an hour's delay, the cannon was also shipped. At twenty minutes past three o'clock, the steamer left the wharf, and went down the harbor.

C. FACTORS OF DISRUPTION: THE UNDOING OF COMPROMISE

The Burns case and other widely publicized fugitive cases, the publication in 1852 of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, the assault by Preston Brooks upon Charles Sumner in the Senate, the attack at a later time of John Brown on Harper's Ferry, and many other sensational events—all made it increasingly difficult to restrain emotions. But in truth the framers of compromise had hardly hoped to do so; they had aspired instead to arrange a settlement solid enough to hold firm in the midst of emotional storms. The key to this settlement was the territorial formula for determining the status of slavery: self-determination in the states, a geographical line in the Louisiana Purchase, and Congressional nonintervention in the Mexican Cession. The third part of this arrangement had won overwhelming public endorsement in the election of 1852, and the other parts enjoyed the sanction of unchallenged

operation for several decades. Yet between 1854 and 1857 the territorial settlement was undone, first by the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 and later by the Dred Scott Decision of 1857; bases of the moderate position were destroyed; and almost everyone was driven to one or the other of the two extreme positions—Calhoun's or Seward's—which had been advanced in 1850. Extracts from the Act and the Supreme Court decision will serve to show the exact destructive effect of each upon geographical division or territorial self-determination as the basis of compromise.

1. *Kansas-Nebraska*. In 1854 Stephen A. Douglas, wishing to promote a transcontinental railroad from Chicago to the Pacific coast, undertook to organize the remaining unorganized area of the Louisiana Purchase into territories. Knowing that he would never receive southern votes for a bill to create new free territories in order to gain for Chicago a railway connection to which New Orleans also aspired, he proposed a basis of organization which would be attractive to southern members. This was the Kansas-Nebraska Bill. Although politically expedient, the bill was also consistent with the position which Douglas had taken in 1850, and it gave for the first time a clear meaning to the principle of Congressional nonintervention which had been applied in ambiguous form in 1850. Douglas secured the enactment of the bill, but in the process he aroused a furor, for it was felt that his measure violated one of the three basic elements of compromise mentioned on page 220.⁹

An Act to Organize the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas.

Be it enacted . . ., That all that part of the territory of the United States included within the following limits, except such portions thereof as are hereinafter expressly exempted from the operations of this act, to wit: beginning at a point in the Missouri River where the fortieth parallel of north latitude crosses the same; thence west on said parallel to the east boundary of the Territory of Utah, on the summit of the Rocky Mountains; thence on said summit northward to the forty-ninth parallel of north latitude; thence east on said parallel to the western boundary of the territory of Minnesota; then southward on said boundary to the Missouri River; thence down the main channel of said river to the place of beginning, be, and the same is hereby, created into a temporary government by the name of the Territory of Nebraska; and when admitted as a State or States, the said Territory, or any portion of the same, shall be received into the Union with or without slavery, as their constitution may prescribe at the time of their admission. . . .

Sec. 14. *And be it further enacted, . . .* That the Constitution, and all laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable, shall have the

same force and effect within the said Territory of Nebraska as elsewhere within the United States, except the eighth section of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri into the Union, approved March sixth, eighteen hundred and twenty, which, being inconsistent with the principle of the non-intervention by Congress with slavery in the States and Territories, as recognized by the legislation of eighteen hundred and fifty, commonly called the Compromise Measures, is hereby declared inoperative and void; it being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to revive or put in force any law or regulation which may have existed prior to the act of sixth March, eighteen hundred and twenty, either protecting, establishing, prohibiting, or abolishing slavery.

[A further section of the act organized the Territory of Kansas, making the same provisions for slavery as were made for the Territory of Nebraska, and in identical language.]

2. *The Dred Scott Decision*. In 1857 the Supreme Court rendered its opinion in the case of a Negro, Dred Scott, who had originally been a slave in Missouri but who had been carried by his master into the free state of Illinois and into the Louisiana Purchase region north of 36° 30'. As a result of residence in these areas he now claimed to be free. The case was complex, also involving contentions as to whether he had a right to bring suit. The Court ruled that he did not, and it might properly have declined to deal with the other questions. In fact, any statements not necessary to the ruling were open to criticism as superfluous dicta which did not have the same judicial force as the rest of the decision. Nevertheless, Chief Justice Taney, speaking for the majority, gave the opinion of the Court on this question. Directly this opinion had an important bearing on one of the three basic elements of compromise mentioned on page 220; but indirectly it had an even more important bearing on a second element—the principle of letting the territories decide for

themselves. The Kansas-Nebraska Act had marked the undoing of part of the compromise but it had not marked the triumph of one of the extreme positions put forward in 1850. The Dred Scott Decision, however, gave the sanction of the highest court to one of these extreme positions.¹⁰

The act of Congress, upon which the plaintiff relies, declares that slavery and involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, shall be forever prohibited in all that part of the territory ceded by France, under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes north latitude, and not included within the limits of Missouri. And the difficulty which meets us at the threshold of this part of the inquiry is, whether Congress was authorized to pass this law under any of the powers granted to it by the Constitution; for if the authority is not given by that instrument, it is the duty of this court to declare it void and inoperative, and incapable of conferring freedom upon any one who is held as a slave under the laws of any one of the States. . . .

The power of Congress over the person or property of a citizen can never be a mere discretionary power under our Constitution and form of Government. The powers of the Government and the rights and privileges of the citizen are regulated and plainly defined by the Constitution itself. And when the Territory becomes a part of the United States, the Federal Government enters into possession in the character impressed upon it by those who created it. It enters upon it with its powers over the citizen strictly defined, and limited by the Constitution, from which it derives its own existence, and by virtue of which alone it continues to exist and act as a Government and sovereignty. It has no power of any kind beyond it; and it cannot, when it enters a Territory of the United States, put off its character, and assume discretionary or despotic powers which the Constitution has denied to it. It cannot create for itself a new character separated from the citizens of the United States, and the duties it owes them under the provisions of the Constitution. The Territory being a part of the United States, the Government and the citizen both enter it under the authority of the Constitution, with their respective rights defined and marked out; and the Federal Government can exercise no power over his person or property, beyond what that instrument confers, nor lawfully deny any right which it has reserved. . . .

The rights of private property have been guarded with equal care. Thus the rights of property are united with the rights of person, and placed on the same ground by the fifth amendment to the Constitution. . . . An Act of Con-

gress which deprives a citizen of the United States of his liberty or property, merely because he came himself or brought his property into a particular Territory of the United States, and who had committed no offense against the laws, could hardly be dignified with the name of due process of law. . . .

And this prohibition is not confined to the States, but the words are general, and extend to the whole territory over which the Constitution gives it power to legislate, including those portions of it remaining under Territorial Government, as well as that covered by States. It is a total absence of power everywhere within the dominion of the United States, and places the citizens of a Territory, so far as these rights are concerned, on the same footing with the citizens of the States, and guards them as firmly and plainly against any inroads which the General Government might attempt, under the plea of implied or incidental powers. And if Congress itself cannot do this—it is beyond the powers conferred on the Federal Government—it will be admitted, we presume, that it could not authorize a Territorial Government to exercise them. It could confer no power on any local Government, established by its authority, to violate the provisions of the Constitution.

It seems, however, to be supposed, that there is a difference between property in a slave and other property, and that different rules may be applied to it in expounding the Constitution of the United States. And the laws and usages of nations, and the writings of eminent jurists upon the relation of master and slave and their mutual rights and duties, and the powers which governments may exercise over it, have been dwelt upon in the argument.

But . . . if the Constitution recognizes the right of property of the master in a slave, and makes no distinction between that description of property and other property owned by a citizen, no tribunal, acting under the authority of the United States, whether it be legislative, executive, or judicial, has a right to draw such a distinction, or deny to it the benefit of the provisions and guarantees which have been provided for the protection of private property against the encroachments of the Government.

Now . . . the right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution. The right to traffic in it, like an ordinary article of merchandise and property, was guaranteed to the citizens of the United States, in every State that might desire it, for twenty years. And the Government in express terms is pledged to protect it in all future time, if the slave escapes from his owner. . . . And no word can be found in the Constitution which gives Congress a greater

power over slave property, or which entitles property of that kind to less protection than property of any other description. The only power conferred is the power coupled with the duty of guarding and protecting the owner in his rights.

Upon these considerations, it is the opinion of the court that the act of Congress which prohibited a citizen from holding and owning property of

this kind in the territory of the United States north of the line therein mentioned, is not warranted by the Constitution, and is therefore void; and that neither Dred Scott himself, nor any of his family, were made free by being carried into this territory; even if they had been carried there by the owner, with the intention of becoming a permanent resident.

Part II. THE CLIMAX OF THE SLAVERY CONTROVERSY

After the Dred Scott Decision the entire structure of compromise lay shattered. Both geographical division by act of Congress and local self-determination by residents of the territories were untenable, and for the next four years the tendency toward sectional alignment grew steadily more pronounced while the tension between the sections mounted.

One of the marked features of this period was the disintegration of the old political parties, which had maintained a bisectional character, and the growth of sectional parties. As late as 1852 both Whigs and Democrats had claimed powerful affiliates in both the North and the South and had sought to uphold national policies which would command support in both regions. But the campaign of 1852 was the last in which the Whig party made an independent nomination. By 1856 the Kansas-Nebraska Act had carried most southern Whigs into the Democratic ranks and most northern Whigs into the new Republican party. In that year, the first Republican Presidential candidate, John C. Frémont, polled 1,341,264 votes but received not one vote south of Virginia. The only remaining national party—the Democratic—elected its nominee, James Buchanan, who carried the five free states of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Indiana, Illinois, and California, and all of the slave states but Maryland, which went to a third candidate, Millard Fillmore. This, however, was the last victory (until after the Civil War) of the Democratic party as a national organization, for in 1860 the Democracy split. Northern Democrats insisted upon Stephen A. Douglas and popular sovereignty; southern Democrats were obdurate in supporting John C. Breckinridge and the Dred Scott decision.

The old Whigs, now calling themselves the Constitutional Union party, with no platform save "the Constitution and the Union," further divided the vote of the moderates, and, as a consequence, Abraham Lincoln won the election. He received less than 40 percent of the vote, the smallest proportion that has ever elected a President, and, like Frémont, he secured no popular votes south of Virginia. In the eyes of the South, therefore, the new President was both a sectional and a minority choice, but this was scarcely to be wondered at when no truly national party remained in the field.

Although history has shown that Lincoln was far more than a sectional President, his election was in truth a purely sectional triumph. It also represented the triumph of the forces which were pledged to arresting the extension of slavery, with the further avowed purpose of putting it on the road to extinction.

In the South the psychological effect of the election was almost to paralyze the forces of nationalism which favored the maintenance of the union, and to precipitate the supreme act of sectionalism—the withdrawal of the southern states to form a new nation of their own. This movement will be treated in the next Problem, but in the meanwhile it is pertinent to examine what Lincoln really stood for in relation to the slavery question and what his victory really meant in terms of sectional relationships and the slavery question. Nothing reveals his position more clearly than a comparison of his views with those of Stephen A. Douglas, who was in every sense his greatest rival.

A. LINCOLN AND DOUGLAS

When Douglas, the triumphant author of the Kansas-Nebraska Act and the principal spokesman of the Popular Sovereignty doctrine, ran for re-election to the Senate in 1858, he was opposed by a relatively obscure Republican, Abraham Lincoln, whose public

career had consisted of one term in the House of Representatives. Douglas at that time enjoyed a well-deserved reputation as the best give-and-take debater in Congress, and it was an act of some audacity for Lincoln to challenge him to a series of debates. The result was perhaps the most famous set of campaign speeches in American history. Today it may be argued that these debates were not on the high intellectual level of such contests as the Webster-Hayne debate in the Senate. It is true that they were not pitched in a lofty tone, for they were addressed to large audiences of average citizens: there was a stump-speech tone about them, with considerable simplification of the issues and constant effort to stimulate the auditors by "scoring" on the antagonist. Despite these conditions, however, they presented the issues with striking clarity and vigor. Neither speaker advanced the southern view that, under the Dred Scott decision, slavery could not be excluded from the territories, but they did represent two widely divergent northern positions. They disagreed completely on (1) the desirable policy toward slavery in the territories, and (2) the place of the Negro in American society, though the divergence was less clear-cut on the second point.

The following selections, principally from the Lincoln-Douglas debates but also from other statements by the two men, illustrate their differences. In reading these it is important to interpret the position of the two men in the light of what they themselves were saying and not to let the reading be colored by what others said about them or by what history and legend have done with them subsequently.

1. *Douglas's View.* Selections from the speeches of Stephen A. Douglas at Alton, Illinois, October 15, 1858, at Quincy, October 13, and at Ottawa, August 21.¹¹

[At Alton]

This Government was made upon the great basis of the sovereignty of the States, the right of each State to regulate its own domestic institutions to suit itself; and that right was conferred with the understanding and expectation that inasmuch as each locality had separate interests, each locality must have different and distinct local and domestic institutions, corresponding to its wants and interests. Our fathers knew when they made the Government that the laws and institutions which were well adapted to the Green Mountains of Vermont were unsuited to the rice plantations of South Carolina. They knew then, as well as we know now, that the laws and institutions which would be well adapted to the beautiful prairies of Illinois would not be suited to the mining regions of California. They knew that in a Republic as broad as this, having such a variety of soil, climate, and interest, there must necessarily be a corresponding variety of local laws,—the policy and institutions of each State adapted to its condition and wants. For this reason this Union was established on the right of each State to do as it pleased on the question of slavery, and every other question; and the various States were not allowed to complain of, much less interfere with, the policy of their neighbors. ["That's good doctrine;" "that's the doctrine," and cheers.]

Suppose the doctrine advocated by Mr. Lincoln and the Abolitionists of this day had prevailed when the Constitution was made, what would have been the result? Imagine for a moment that

Mr. Lincoln had been a member of the Convention that framed the Constitution of the United States, and that when its members were about to sign that wonderful document, he had arisen in that Convention as he did at Springfield this summer, and, addressing himself to the President, had said, "A house divided against itself cannot stand; [laughter] this Government, divided into Free and Slave States cannot endure, they must all be Free or all be Slave; they must all be one thing, or all the other,—otherwise, it is a violation of the law of God, and cannot continue to exist;"—suppose Mr. Lincoln had convinced that body of sages that that doctrine was sound, what would have been the result? Remember that the Union was then composed of thirteen States, twelve of which were slaveholding, and one free. Do you think that the one Free State would have outvoted the twelve slaveholding States, and thus have secured the abolition of slavery? ["No, no."] On the other hand, would not the twelve slaveholding States have outvoted the one Free State, and thus have fastened slavery, by a constitutional provision, on every foot of the American republic forever?

You see that if this Abolition doctrine of Mr. Lincoln had prevailed when the Government was made, it would have established slavery as a permanent institution in all the States, whether they wanted it or not; and the question for us to determine in Illinois now, as one of the Free States, is whether or not we are willing, having become the majority section, to enforce a doctrine on the minority which we would have resisted with our hearts' blood had it been attempted on us when we were in a minority. ["We never will;" "good, good;" and cheers.] How has the South lost her power as the majority section in this

Union, and how have the Free States gained it, except under the operation of that principle which declares the right of the people of each State and each Territory to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way? It was under that principle that slavery was abolished in New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania; it was under that principle that one half of the slaveholding States became free; it was under that principle that the number of Free States increased until, from being one out of twelve States, we have grown to be the majority of States of the whole Union with the power to control the House of Representatives and Senate, and the power, consequently, to elect a President by Northern votes, without the aid of a Southern State. Having obtained this power under the operation of that great principle, are you now prepared to abandon the principle and declare that merely because we have the power you will wage a war against the Southern States and their institutions until you force them to abolish slavery everywhere? ["No, never;" and great applause.]

[*At Quincy*]

I repeat that the principle is the right of each State, each Territory, to decide this slavery question for itself, to have slavery or not, as it chooses; and it does not become Mr. Lincoln, or anybody else, to tell the people of Kentucky that they have no consciences, that they are living in a state of iniquity, and that they are cherishing an institution to their bosoms in violation of the law of God. Better for him to adopt the doctrine of "Judge not, lest ye shall be judged." ["Good," and applause.] Let him perform his own duty at home, and he will have a better fate in the future. I think there are objects of charity enough in the Free States to excite the sympathies and open the pockets of all the benevolence we have amongst us, without going abroad in search of negroes, of whose condition we know nothing. We have enough objects of charity at home, and it is our duty to take care of our own poor and of our own suffering, before we go abroad to intermeddle with other peoples' business.

[*At Ottawa*]

I ask you, are you in favor of conferring upon the negro the rights and privileges of citizenship? ["No, no."] Do you desire to strike out of our State Constitution that clause which keeps slaves and free negroes out of the State, and allow the free negroes to flow in, ["Never."] and cover your prairies with black settlements? Do you desire to turn this beautiful State into a free negro colony, ["No, no."] in order that when Missouri abolishes slavery she can send one hundred thou-

sand emancipated slaves into Illinois, to become citizens and voters, on an equality with yourselves? ["Never," "no."] If you desire negro citizenship, if you desire to allow them to come into the State and settle with the white man, if you desire them to vote on an equality with yourselves, and to make them eligible to office, to serve on juries, and to adjudge your rights, then support Mr. Lincoln and the Black Republican party, who are in favor of the citizenship of the negro. ["Never, never."] For one, I am opposed to negro citizenship in any and every form. [Cheers.] I believe this Government was made on the white basis. ["Good."] I believe it was made by white men, for the benefit of white men and their posterity forever, and I am in favor of confining citizenship to white men, men of European birth and descent, instead of conferring it upon negroes, Indians, and other inferior races. ["Good for you." "Douglas forever."]

Mr. Lincoln, following the example and lead of all the little Abolition orators, who go around and lecture in the basements of schools and churches, reads from the Declaration of Independence that all men were created equal, and then asks, How can you deprive a negro of that equality which God and the Declaration of Independence award to him? He and they maintain that negro equality is guaranteed by the laws of God, and that it is asserted in the Declaration of Independence. If they think so, of course they have a right to say so, and so vote. I do not question Mr. Lincoln's conscientious belief that the negro was made his equal, and hence is his brother; [laughter] but for my own part, I do not regard the negro as my equal, and positively deny that he is my brother, or any kin to me whatever. ["Never," "Hit him again," and cheers.] Lincoln has evidently learned by heart Parson Lovejoy's catechism. [Laughter and applause.] He can repeat it as well as Farnsworth, and he is worthy of a medal from Father Giddings and Fred Douglass for his Abolitionism. [Laughter.] He holds that the negro was born his equal and yours, and that he was endowed with equality by the Almighty, and that no human law can deprive him of these rights, which were guaranteed to him by the Supreme Ruler of the Universe.

Now I do not believe that the Almighty ever intended the negro to be the equal of the white man. ["Never, never."] If he did, he has been a long time demonstrating the fact. [Cheers.] For thousands of years the negro has been a race upon the earth, and during all that time, in all latitudes and climates, wherever he has wandered or been taken, he has been inferior to the race which he has there met. He belongs to an inferior race and must always occupy an inferior position. ["Good," "that's so," etc.] I do not hold that because the

negro is our inferior that therefore he ought to be a slave. By no means can such a conclusion be drawn from what I have said. On the contrary, I hold that humanity and Christianity both require that the negro shall have and enjoy every right, every privilege, and every immunity consistent with the safety of the society in which he lives.

2. *Lincoln on Slavery in the Territories.*

Lincoln made his most thorough reply to the "Popular Sovereignty," or territorial self-government doctrine, not in the actual series of joint debates with Douglas but in a speech at Peoria, October 16, 1854. While this was not part of the senatorial contest, it was made in reply to a speech by Douglas and has been characterized as a prelude to the joint debates.¹²

Equal justice to the South, it is said, requires us to consent to the extension of slavery to new countries. That is to say, inasmuch as you do not object to my taking my hog to Nebraska, therefore I must not object to you taking your slave. Now, I admit that this is perfectly logical, if there is no difference between hogs and negroes. But while you thus require me to deny the humanity of the negro, I wish to ask whether you of the south yourselves, have ever been willing to do as much? It is kindly provided that of all those who come into the world, only a small percentage are natural tyrants. That percentage is no larger in the slave States than in the free. The great majority, south as well as north, have human sympathies, of which they can no more divest themselves than they can of their sensibility to physical pain. These sympathies in the bosoms of the southern people, manifest in many ways, their sense of the wrong of slavery, and their consciousness that, after all, there is humanity in the negro. If they deny this, let me address them a few plain questions. In 1820 you joined the north, almost unanimously, in declaring the African slave trade piracy, and in annexing to it the punishment of death. Why did you do this? If you did not feel that it was wrong, why did you join in providing that men should be hung for it? The practice was no more than bringing wild negroes from Africa, to sell to such as would buy them. But you never thought of hanging men for catching and selling wild horses, wild buffaloes or wild bears.

Again, you have amongst you, a sneaking individual, of the class of native tyrants, known as the "Slave-Dealer." He watches your necessities, and crawls up to buy your slave, at a speculating price. If you cannot help it, you sell to him; but if you can help it, you drive him from your door. You despise him utterly. You do not recognize him as a friend, or even as an honest man. Your children must not play with his; they may rollick

freely with the little negroes, but not with the "slave-dealer's" children. If you are obliged to deal with him, you try to get through the job without so much as touching him. It is common with you to join hands with the men you meet, but with the slave-dealer you avoid the ceremony—instinctively shrinking from the snaky contact. If he grows rich and retires from business, you still remember him, and still keep up the ban of non-intercourse upon him and his family. Now why is this? You do not so treat the man who deals in corn, cattle or tobacco.

And yet again, there are in the United States and territories, including the District of Columbia, 433,643 free blacks. At five hundred dollars per head they are worth over two hundred millions of dollars. How comes this vast amount of property to be running about without owners? We do not see free horses or free cattle running at large. How is this? All these free blacks are the descendants of slaves, or have been slaves themselves, and they would be slaves now, but for *something* which has operated on their white owners, inducing them, at vast pecuniary sacrifices, to liberate them. What is that *something*? Is there any mistaking it? In all these cases it is your sense of justice, and human sympathy, continually telling you, that the poor negro has some natural right to himself—that those who deny it, and make mere merchandise of him, deserve kickings, contempt and death.

And now, why will you ask us to deny the humanity of the slave? and estimate him only as the equal of the hog? Why ask us to do what you will not do yourselves? Why ask us to do for *nothing*, what two hundred millions of dollars could not induce you to do?

But one great argument in the support of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, is still to come. That argument is "the sacred right of self government." . . .

I trust I understand, and truly estimate the right of self-government. My faith in the proposition that each man should do precisely as he pleases with all which is exclusively his own, lies at the foundation of the sense of justice there is in me. I extend the principle to communities of men, as well as to individuals. I so extend it, because it is politically wise, as well as naturally just; politically wise in saving us from broils about matters which do not concern us.—Here or at Washington, I would not trouble myself with the oyster laws of Virginia, or the cranberry laws of Indiana.

The doctrine of self-government is right—absolutely and eternally right—but it has no just application, as here attempted. Or perhaps I should rather say that whether it has such application depends upon whether a negro is *not* or *is* a man. If he is *not* a man, why in that case, he who is a

man may, as a matter of self-government, do just as he pleases with him. But if the negro *is* a man, is it not to that extent a total destruction of self-government, to say that he too shall not govern *himself*? When the white man governs himself that is self-government; but when he governs himself, and also governs *another* man, that is *more* than self-government—that is despotism. If the negro is a *man*, why then my ancient faith teaches me that “all men are created equal;” and that there can be no moral right in connection with one man’s making a slave of another.

Judge Douglas frequently, with bitter irony and sarcasm, paraphrases our argument by saying: “The white people of Nebraska are good enough to govern themselves, *but they are not good enough to govern a few miserable negroes!*”

Well I doubt not that the people of Nebraska are, and will continue to be as good as the average of people elsewhere. I do not say the contrary. What I do say is, that no man is good enough to govern another man, *without that other’s consent*. . . . Allow ALL the governed an equal voice in the government, and that, and that only, is self-government.

Let it not be said I am contending for the establishment of political and social equality between the whites and blacks. I have already said the contrary. I am not now combating the argument of NECESSITY, arising from the fact that the blacks are already amongst us; but I am combating what is set up as MORAL argument for allowing them to be taken where they have never yet been—arguing against the EXTENSION of a bad thing, which where it already exists we must of necessity, manage as we best can.

In support of his application of the doctrine of self-government, Senator Douglas has sought to bring to his aid the opinions and examples of our revolutionary fathers. I am glad he has done this. I love the sentiments of those old-time men; and shall be most happy to abide by their opinions. He shows us that when it was in contemplation for the colonies to break off from Great Britain, and set up a new government for themselves, several of the states instructed their delegates to go for the measure, PROVIDED EACH STATE SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO REGULATE ITS DOMESTIC CONCERNS IN ITS OWN WAY. I do not quote; but this in substance. This was right. I see nothing objectionable in it. I also think it probable that it had some reference to the existence of slavery amongst them. I will not deny that it had. But had it, any reference, to the carrying of slavery into NEW COUNTRIES? That is the question; and we will let the fathers themselves answer it.

This same generation of men, and mostly the same individuals of the generation, who declared this principle—who declared independence—who

fought the war of the revolution through—who afterward made the constitution under which we still live—these same men passed the ordinance of ’87, declaring that slavery should never go to the north-west territory. I have no doubt Judge Douglas thinks they were very inconsistent in this. It is a question of discrimination between them and him. But there is not an inch of ground left for his claiming that their opinions—their example—their authority—are on his side in this controversy.

Again, is not Nebraska, while a territory, a part of us? Do we not own the country? And if we surrender the control of it, do we not surrender the right of self-government? It is part of ourselves. If you say we shall not control it because it is ONLY part, the same is true of every other part; and when all the parts are gone, what has become of the whole? What is then left of us? What use for the General Government, when there is nothing left for it [to?] govern?

But you say this question should be left to the people of Nebraska, because they are more particularly interested. If this be the rule, you must leave it to each individual to say for himself whether he will have slaves. What better moral right have thirty-one citizens of Nebraska to say, that the thirty-second shall not hold slaves, than the people of the thirty-one States have to say that slavery shall not go into the thirty-second State at all?

But if it is a sacred right for the people of Nebraska to take and hold slaves there, it is equally their sacred right to buy them where they can buy them cheapest; and that undoubtedly will be on the coast of Africa; provided you will consent to not hang them for going there to buy them. You must remove this restriction too, from the sacred right of self-government. I am aware you say that taking slaves from the States to Nebraska, does not make slaves of freemen; but the African slave-trader can say just as much. He does not catch free negroes and bring them here. He finds them already slaves in the hands of their black captors, and he honestly buys them at the rate of about a red cotton handkerchief a head. This is very cheap, and it is a great abridgment of the sacred right of self-government to hang men for engaging in this profitable trade.

Another important objection to this application of the right of self-government, is that it enables the first FEW to deprive the succeeding MANY, of a free exercise of the right of self-government. The first few may get slavery IN, and the subsequent many cannot easily get it OUT. How common is the remark now in the slave States—“If we were only clear of our slaves, how much better it would be for us.” They are actually deprived of the privilege of governing themselves as they would, by

the action of a very few, in the beginning. The same thing was true of the whole nation at the time our constitution was formed.

Whether slavery shall go into Nebraska, or other new territories, is not a matter of exclusive concern to the people who may go there. The whole nation is interested that the best use shall be made of these territories. We want them for homes of free white people. This they cannot be, to any considerable extent, if slavery shall be planted within them. Slave States are places for poor white people to remove FROM; not to remove TO. New free States are the places for poor people to go to and better their condition. For this use, the nation needs these territories.

Still further: there are constitutional relations between the slave and free States, which are degrading to the latter. We are under legal obligations to catch and return their runaway slaves to them—a sort of dirty, disagreeable job which I believe, as a general rule, the slave-holders will not perform for one another. Then again, in the control of the government—the management of the partnership affairs—they have greatly the advantage of us. By the Constitution each State has two senators, each has a number of Representatives, in proportion to the number of its people—and each has a number of presidential electors, equal to the whole number of its Senators and Representatives together. But in ascertaining the number of the people, for this purpose, five slaves are counted as being equal to three whites. The slaves do not vote; they are only counted and so used as to swell the influence of the white people's votes. The practical effect of this is more aptly shown by a comparison of the States of South Carolina and Maine. South Carolina has six representatives, and so has Maine; South Carolina has eight presidential electors, and so has Maine. This is precise equality so far; and, of course they are equal in Senators, each having two. Thus in control of the government, the two States are equals precisely. But how are they in the number of their white people? Maine has 581,813—while South Carolina has 274,567. Maine has twice as many as South Carolina, and 32,679 over.—Thus each white man in South Carolina is more than the double of any man in Maine. This is all because South Carolina, besides her free people, has 384,984 slaves. The South Carolinian has precisely the same advantage over the white man in every other free State, as well as in Maine. He is more than the double of any one of us in this crowd. The same advantage, but not to the same extent, is held by all the citizens of the slave States, over those of the free; and it is an absolute truth, without an exception, that there is no voter in any slave State, but who has more legal power in the government, than any voter in any free State.

There is no instance of exact equality; and the disadvantage is against us the whole chapter through. This principle, in the aggregate, gives the slave States in the present Congress, twenty additional representatives—being seven more than the whole majority by which they passed the Nebraska bill.

Now all this is manifestly unfair; yet I do not mention it to complain of it, in so far as it is already settled. It is in the constitution; and I do not, for that cause, or any other cause, propose to destroy, or alter, or disregard the constitution. I stand to it, fairly, fully, and firmly.

But when I am told I must leave it altogether to OTHER PEOPLE to say whether new partners are to be bred up and brought into the firm, on the same degrading terms against me, I respectfully demur. I insist, that whether I shall be a whole man, or only the half of one, in comparison with others, is a question in which I am somewhat concerned; and one which no other man can have a sacred right of deciding for me. If I am wrong in this—if it really be a sacred right of self-government, in the man who shall go to Nebraska, to decide whether he will be the EQUAL of me or the DOUBLE of me, then, after he shall have exercised that right, and thereby shall have reduced me to a still smaller fraction of a man than I already am, I should like for some gentleman, deeply skilled in the mysteries of sacred rights, to provide himself with a microscope, and peep about, and find out, if he can, what has become of my sacred rights!—They will surely be too small for detection with the naked eye.

Finally, I insist that if there is ANY THING which it is the duty of the WHOLE PEOPLE to never entrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity, of their own liberties, and institutions. And if they shall think, as I do, that the extension of slavery endangers them, more than any, or all other causes, how recreant to themselves, if they submit the question, and with it, the fate of their country, to a mere handful of men bent only on temporary self-interest. If this question of slavery extension were an insignificant one—one having no power to do harm—it might be shuffled aside in this way. But being, as it is, the great Behemoth of danger, shall the strong grip of the nation be loosened upon him, to entrust him to the hands of such feeble keepers?

I have done with this mighty argument, of self-government. Go, sacred thing! Go in peace.

3. *Lincoln on Slavery in the States.* Lincoln repeatedly asserted his intention to respect the Constitutional rights of the slaveholders. These selections are from letters to his friend Joshua Speed and to Alexander H. Stephens

and from his first inaugural address, delivered when the states of the lower South had already adopted ordinances of secession.¹³

[Lincoln to Speed, August 24, 1855]

You know what a poor correspondent I am. Ever since I received your very agreeable letter of the 22nd. of May I have been intending to write you in answer to it. You suggest that in political action now, you and I would differ. I suppose we would; not quite as much, however, as you may think. You know I dislike slavery; and you fully admit the abstract wrong of it. So far there is no cause of difference. But you say that sooner than yield your legal right to the slave—especially at the bidding of those who are not themselves interested, you would see the Union dissolved. I am not aware that *any one* is bidding you to yield that right; very certainly *I* am not. I leave that matter entirely to yourself. I also acknowledge *your* rights and *my* obligations, under the constitution, in regard to your slaves. I confess I hate to see the poor creatures hunted down, and caught, and carried back to their stripes, and unrewarded toils; but I bite my lip and keep quiet.

In 1841 you and I had together a tedious low-water trip, on a Steam Boat from Louisville to St. Louis. You may remember, as I well do, that from Louisville to the mouth of the Ohio, there were, on board, ten or a dozen slaves, shackled together with irons. That sight was a continued torment to me; and I see something like it every time I touch the Ohio, or any other slave-border. It is not fair for you to assume, that I have no interest in a thing which has, and continually exercises, the power of making me miserable. You ought rather to appreciate how much the great body of the Northern people do crucify their feelings, in order to maintain their loyalty to the Constitution and the Union.

[Lincoln to Stephens, December 22, 1860]

My dear Sir

Your obliging answer to my short note is just received, and for which please accept my thanks. I fully appreciate the present peril the country is in, and the weight of responsibility on me.

Do the people of the South really entertain fears that a Republican administration would, *directly*, or *indirectly*, interfere with their slaves, or with them, about their slaves? If they do, I wish to assure you, as once a friend, and still, I hope, not an enemy, that there is no cause for such fears.

The South would be in no more danger in this respect, than it was in the days of Washington. I suppose, however, this does not meet the case. You think slavery is *right*, and ought to be extended; while we think it is *wrong* and ought to be

restricted. That I suppose is the rub. It certainly is the only substantial difference between us.

[First Inaugural Address, March 4, 1861]

Apprehension seems to exist among the people of the Southern States, that by the accession of a Republican Administration, their property, and their peace, and personal security, are to be endangered. There has never been any reasonable cause for such apprehension. Indeed, the most ample evidence to the contrary has all the while existed, and been open to their inspection. It is found in nearly all the published speeches of him who now addresses you. I do but quote from one of those speeches when I declare that "I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so." Those who nominated and elected me did so with full knowledge that I had made this, and many similar declarations, and had never recanted them.

And more than this, they placed in the platform, for my acceptance, and as a law to themselves, and to me, the clear and emphatic resolution which I now read:

"*Resolved*, That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend; and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes."

I now reiterate these sentiments: and in doing so, I only press upon the public attention the most conclusive evidence of which the case is susceptible, that the property, peace and security of no section are to be in any wise endangered by the now incoming Administration. I add too, that all the protection which, consistently with the Constitution and the laws, can be given, will be cheerfully given to all the States when lawfully demanded, for whatever cause—as cheerfully to one section as to another.

There is much controversy about the delivering up of fugitives from service or labor. The clause I now read is as plainly written in the Constitution as any other of its provisions:

"No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

It is scarcely questioned that this provision was intended by those who made it, for the reclaiming

of what we call fugitive slaves; and the intention of the law-giver is the law. All members of Congress swear their support to the whole Constitution—to this provision as much as to any other. To the proposition, then, that slaves whose cases come within the terms of this clause, "shall be delivered up," their oaths are unanimous.

4. *Lincoln and Negro Rights.* Far less consistent than his opinions on slavery were Lincoln's views on the place of the free Negro in the democratic community. In his speech at Peoria he recognized the difficulty of the problem, and in other speeches at Chicago and at Charleston, Illinois, he seemed to waver in his belief as to what civil rights and rights as a citizen the Negro ought to enjoy.¹⁴

[At Peoria]

When southern people tell us they are no more responsible for the origin of slavery, than we; I acknowledge the fact. When it is said that the institution exists, and that it is very difficult to get rid of it, in any satisfactory way, I can understand and appreciate the saying. I surely will not blame them for not doing what I should not know how to do myself. If all earthly power were given me, I should not know what to do, as to the existing institution. My first impulse would be to free all the slaves, and send them to Liberia,—to their own native land. But a moment's reflection would convince me, that whatever of high hope, (as I think there is) there may be in this, in the long run, its sudden execution is impossible. If they were all landed there in a day, they would all perish in the next ten days; and there are not surplus shipping and surplus money enough in the world to carry them there in many times ten days.

What then? Free them all, and keep them among us as underlings? Is it quite certain that this betters their condition? I think I would not hold one in slavery, at any rate; yet the point is not clear enough to me to denounce people upon. What next?—Free them, and make then politically and socially, our equals? My own feelings will not admit of this; and if mine would, we well know that those of the great mass of white people will not. Whether this feeling accords with justice and sound judgment, is not the sole question, if indeed, it is any part of it. A universal feeling, whether well or ill-founded, can not be safely disregarded. We can not, then, make them equals. It does seem to me that systems of gradual emancipation might be adopted; but for their tardiness in this, I will not undertake to judge our brethren of the south.

[At Chicago]

These arguments that are made, that the inferior race are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying; that as much is to be done for them as their condition will allow. What are these arguments? They are the arguments that kings have made for enslaving the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments in favor of kingcraft were of this class; they always bestrode the necks of the people, not that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better off for being ridden. That is their argument, and this argument of the Judge is the same old serpent that says, you work, and I eat, you toil, and I will enjoy the fruits of it. . . . I should like to know if taking this old Declaration of Independence, which declares that all men are equal upon principle, and making exceptions to it, where will it stop? If one man says it does not mean a negro, why may not another say it does not mean some other man? If that Declaration is not the truth, let us get the Statute book in which we find it and tear it out! Who is so bold as to do it! If it is not true let us tear it out! [cries of "no, no,"] let us stick to it then [cheers]. Let us stand firmly by it then [applause]. . . .

My friends, I have detained you about as long as I desired to do, and I have only to say, let us discard all this quibbling about this man and the other man—this race and that race and the other race being inferior, and therefore they must be placed in an inferior position—discarding our standard that we have left us. Let us discard all these things, and unite as one people throughout this land, until we shall once more stand up declaring that all men are created equal.

[At Charleston, Illinois]

While I was at the hotel to-day, an elderly gentleman called upon me to know whether I was really in favor of producing a perfect equality between the negroes and white people. [Great laughter.] While I had not proposed to myself on this occasion to say much on that subject, yet as the question was asked me, I thought I would occupy perhaps five minutes in saying something in regard to it. I will say, then, that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races; [applause] that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say, in addition to this, that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality.

And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race. . . .

Judge Douglas has said to you that he has not been able to get from me an answer to the question whether I am in favor of negro citizenship. So far as I know, the Judge never asked me the question before. [Applause.] He shall have no occasion to ever ask it again, for I tell him very frankly that I am not in favor of negro citizenship. [Renewed applause.] This furnishes me an occasion for saying a few words upon the subject. I mentioned, in a certain speech of mine which has been printed, that the Supreme Court had decided that a negro could not possibly be made a citizen; and without saying what was my ground of complaint in regard to that, or whether I had any ground

of complaint, Judge Douglas has from that thing manufactured nearly everything that he ever says about my disposition to produce an equality between the negroes and the white people. [Laughter and applause.] If any one will read my speech, he will find I mentioned that as one of the points decided in the course of the Supreme Court opinions, but I did not state what objection I had to it. But Judge Douglas tells the people what my objection was when I did not tell them myself. [Loud applause and laughter.] Now, my opinion is that the different States have the power to make a negro a citizen, under the Constitution of the United States, if they choose. The Dred Scott decision decides that they have not that power. If the State of Illinois had that power, I should be opposed to the exercise of it. [Cries of "Good, good," and applause.] That is all I have to say about it.

B. WAS THE VICTORY OF LINCOLN AND HIS PARTY A THREAT TO THE INSTITUTION OF SLAVERY?

The secession of the southern states in 1860-61 came as a direct reaction to Lincoln's election to the Presidency. The South regarded his victory not only as a triumph of the antislavery cause but as a direct menace to the security of slavery in the South. As preceding selections have shown, Lincoln had expressed enough disapproval of slavery to give some ground for this view; at the same time he had asserted a firm purpose to respect southern constitutional rights. Historians, therefore, still debate whether the South was justified in its fears. Two writers of standing, Arthur C. Cole and J. G. de R. Hamilton, have presented opposing interpretations of this question in two articles, both entitled "Lincoln's Election an Immediate Menace to Slavery in the States?"¹⁵

1. *Extracts from Professor Cole's Discussion.*

Lincoln entered politics as a Whig with the large, prosperous, slaveholding planters of the South as party associates. When in 1847-1848 he reached the national political field as a member of Congress from the Springfield district, he promptly made warm friends and associates with a group of young Southern Whigs who were among the first to espouse the presidential candidacy of General Zachary Taylor, a slaveholder. In behalf of this Southerner in the presidential election of 1848 he spurned the Free Soil party which offered some promise as an independent antislavery party.

With the break-up of the Whig party over the Kansas-Nebraska Act, Lincoln showed a strong reluctance to abandon his Whig connections. While assuming firm anti-Nebraska ground, he showed absolutely no sympathy for the original Republican movement in Illinois, which found itself unable to make progress except among the really radical antislavery element. He refused to

allow the use of his name as member of the abortive state central committee organized by Owen Lovejoy in 1854. For a time he continued to call himself a Whig; later he cooperated with those who sought to keep the antislavery extension movement in Illinois on "respectable," "conservative" ground. The shock of Lovejoy's nomination for Congress in 1856 "turned me blind," he wrote figuratively to a friend.

Though a Frémont elector-at-large in 1856, in his numerous campaign speeches he seems studiously to have avoided referring to himself or to his party associates under the designation, "Republican." As late as 1859 he was conferring with the conservative opposition leaders in the Southern border states on the possibility of a united stand against the Buchanan administration; in a speech at Cincinnati he indicated a preference for a Southern man on the 1860 ticket, explaining that the "proslavery party must be showed [*sic*] that the Republicans, in opposing the aggrandizement of slavery, were friends of the Union and promoters of the general good." In the campaign

of 1860 his claims were pushed as those of a conservative Republican standing substantially on Henry Clay ground. Again and again did he repeat the Republican guarantee to the institution of slavery in the Southern states where it already existed. Even after his election he assured his old friend, Alexander H. Stephens of Georgia, of the absolute safety of the slaveholder in his property rights.

Contemporary and later belief in Lincoln's abolitionist position seems to have rested largely upon the assumed meaning of his famous "House Divided" speech of June, 1858, which was interpreted as the proclamation of a crusade to eradicate slavery from the nation. Lincoln consistently denied this interpretation and insisted that it was no more than a prophetic utterance of grave moral import. . . . Indeed, perhaps he never before his Presidency reached a more definite attitude than when at Peoria in 1854 he admitted his inability to offer any adequate, immediate solution of the slavery problem: "If all earthly power were given me, I should not know what to do as to the existing institution."

These were not the words of a man who would carry abolition doctrines—however moderate—into the White House. Indeed, as the outbreak of armed strife seemed to many to bring about a clear issue between the forces of freedom and slavery, even at the risk of his popularity in the North, Lincoln firmly resisted the abolition tide that swept over the North. When finally the institution of slavery was well on the road to its doom and Lincoln was sent to his martyrdom, James Redpath, the Massachusetts abolitionist, insisted that there should be no illusion as to Lincoln's contribution toward the new era of freedom: "Lincoln was an emancipationist by compulsion. . . . Lincoln was made a saint and liberator in spite of himself; he was cuffed into the calendar; he was kicked into glory; he did not voluntarily rise up, he was floated upon the restless will of the people, to the height he now occupies." . . .

It is very difficult to appraise the exact influence in the Republican party of the professed abolitionists. Although moderate political abolitionists, like Owen Lovejoy of Illinois, had locally contributed much to the beginnings—sometimes abortive beginnings—of the Republican party, few of the veteran defenders of the faith were in any way satisfied with the new party movement. The Garrisonian idealists completely ignored the early phases of Republicanism; later they noticed it only to vent their scorn upon it. "By its own showing," declared one of their spokesmen, "it is not an anti-slavery, but merely an anti-slavery-extension party. . . ."

With the nomination of Lincoln, [Wendell] Phillips voiced the disappointment and disgust

of many Garrisonians when he declared: "We cannot afford . . . to let Mr. Lincoln succeed, because, if he should, the country will say, 'The North has got the helm, let us see what the North is ready to do—wait!'—and we shall have four years of waiting, to see what Abe Lincoln won't do!" Garrison editorially "gibbeted" Lincoln as the "slave-hound of Illinois." Nor were the political abolitionists, less schooled perhaps in intransigence, much more satisfied. A movement for the nomination of a straight-out Abolition ticket was engineered which culminated in a convention at Syracuse, on August 29, where Gerrit Smith was nominated for the Presidency, and a resolution adopted: "That for Abolitionists to vote for a candidate like Abraham Lincoln, who stands ready to execute the accursed Fugitive Slave Law, to suppress insurrections among slaves, to admit new slave States, and to support the ostracism, socially and politically, of the black man of the North, is to give the lie to their professions, to expose their hypocrisy to the world, and to do what they can to put off the day of the slave's deliverance." It can hardly be contended, therefore, that the veterans of the abolition movement looked toward Lincoln's administration as their great opportunity for speeding the day of fulfillment.

It must be said, however, that doctrinaires like Wendell Phillips, at times reversing their logic, argued that in spite of milk and water nonextension and union-loving resolutions and pronouncements, "the Republican party, so far as it has a heart, means to grapple slavery, and to strangle it, so soon as they can." . . . When on November 7 the telegraph announced Lincoln's election as an accomplished fact, Phillips rejoiced that "for the first time in our history the *slave* has chosen a president of the United States. . . . It is the moral effect of this victory," he explained, "not anything which his administration can or will probably do, that gives value to this success. Not an Abolitionist, hardly an antislavery man, Mr. Lincoln consents to represent an antislavery idea. . . ."

2. *Extracts from Professor Hamilton's Discussion.*

Among Republican leaders Lincoln appears as relatively conservative, but a close study of his writings indicates that he, too, grew fast to radicalism, that he was touched—"all broke out"—with abolition, to quote a contemporary opinion of him in 1856. He had started out with the idea of restoring the Missouri Compromise, but quickly opposed such a suggestion; he had advocated allowing the Supreme Court to settle the territorial question, and then fiercely attacked the Court for attempting to do so; intimately familiar with the scope and character of the abolition crusade, en-

tirely aware of the falsity of most of the propaganda employed, and fully conscious of its effect in the South, he not only never denounced it, or in any way opposed it, but was himself increasingly influenced in opinion by it.

In 1856 he said: "We shall be in a majority after a while, and then the revolution which we shall accomplish will be none the less radical from being the result of pacific measures. . . . Slavery is a violation of eternal right. We have temporized with it from the necessities of our condition." Slavery he pronounced "a detestable crime and ruinous to the nation." Nor was his attitude toward slave-owners reassuring. "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and, under the rule of a just God, cannot long retain it. If this thing is allowed to continue, it will be but one step further to impress the same rule in Illinois." And the close of the speech was a threat of war not thinly veiled.

From the time the Dred Scott decision was handed down until 1860, he never lost opportunity to insinuate and develop and strengthen in the public mind the idea hinted at in the last sentence quoted above, namely, that unless the South were checked, it would force slavery upon an unwilling North. It was effective propaganda. In fact, so successful was he in arousing fear and anger against this supposed culminating aggression of the "slave oligarchy," that it is not improbable that he made more Abolitionists than the Abolitionists themselves.

The "House Divided" speech in 1858, while it advocated no specific aggression upon slavery, was none the less a declaration of war, and at Chicago he developed the idea, declaring his desire that slavery should be put in the course of ultimate extinction. Here, too, appears the statement of another doctrine equally inimical to

Southern interest. "Let us discard all this quibbling about this man and the other man, this race and that race, and the other race being inferior, and therefore they must be placed in an inferior position. Let us . . . unite as one people . . . until we shall once more stand up declaring that all men are created equal." At intervals, he specifically denied any such view, but again and again restated it, until the *New York Times* was able to say at the close of the campaign of 1860 that he asserted for the negroes "a perfect equality of civil and personal rights under the Constitution."

There were other assertions of Lincoln which indicate his essential radicalism. "Slavery," he declared at Alton, "is the real issue. That is the issue that will continue in this country when these poor tongues of Judge Douglas and myself shall be silent. It is the eternal struggle between the two principles—right and wrong—throughout the world." . . .

Thus, while he professed belief in the right of a state to regulate its domestic institutions, he incessantly strove to arouse in the North the same hatred of slavery which he himself felt—a hatred, as he declared, as great as that of any Abolitionist. And throughout his speeches may be seen and felt the presence of a nationalism that relegated the states to the relative position of counties. Seward might well say in 1860: "Abraham Lincoln confesses his obligation to the higher law . . . and avows himself, for weal or woe, life or death, a soldier on the side of freedom in the irrepressible conflict between freedom and slavery." Well might radical Republicans in 1860 proclaim him an Abolitionist. Well might Thurlow Weed declare that when Lincoln was inaugurated "an affirmative policy" would also be inaugurated.

C. THE ADEQUACY OF THE POLITICAL ISSUES AS A CAUSE OF SECTIONAL STRIFE

Nearly everything written by the participants at the time of the contest over slavery in the territories and by historians since has been designed to vindicate one side or the other as being "right" while the other side was "wrong." Hardly any attention has been given to the question whether the issue of slavery in the territories was really important enough to justify all the prominence which was given to it—whether it was a real issue, involving genuine stakes or whether it was an abstraction played up by sectional politicians for the sake of political advantage. Yet the ultimate test of the statesmanship of America during the sectional crisis is connected with the question whether the alternatives offered by Lincoln and Douglas or other leaders differed in their basic significance sufficiently to justify the immense sectional consequences which followed from the political contest. Were the territorial and the fugitive slave questions great enough in the number of people involved or in the potential results to justify convulsing the country for their sake?

This inquiry raises again from the standpoint of history the same questions that Daniel Webster raised in 1850 from the standpoint of current policy. Some of the best-qualified

analysts today feel that Webster's position was the only realistic one and that the constant agitation of the territorial question was a tragic and unnecessary blunder. This view deserves careful consideration, but in weighing it one should at all times remember that men agitated the territorial issue not because they regarded it as the essential problem of slavery but because it was the principal way in which the great force of antislavery feeling could manifest itself without violating Constitutional inhibitions. In statistical terms the territorial question involved a few dozen slaves; in emotional terms these few dozen symbolized the four million whose slavery was Constitutionally immune from attack.

1. *J. G. Randall's Analysis.* The foremost contemporary student of Lincoln's career as President is J. G. Randall of the University of Illinois. His appraisal of the territorial issue follows.¹⁶

It is significant to note how far sectional agitation by politicians was concerned with two points—the fugitive slave question and slavery in the territories—and then, by analysis of the contemporary situation, to find how utterly inadequate each of these factors was as *casus belli* or ground for disunion. There is, of course, the broader explanation of the Southern movement on cultural lines, and volumes have been written on the economic background of the crisis. The economy of a great nation, however, has many facets, and one does not exhaust economic truth by noting disruptive tendencies. Sections with diverse interests could logically have treated those interests as supplementing factors making for a well rounded nation. . . . If there was a group in the South who insisted upon secession for cultural motives, it was that group known at the time as secessionists *per se*, and all the evidence tends to show that this group was a minority. Even the men of this group, however, used slavery "grievances" to make their case, denouncing low-tariff Northern Democrats as well as Republicans, so that the stock complaints of the time cannot in any case be ignored if one is studying factors of agitation.

In this agitation the traditional "grievances" were used out of all proportion to their solid content. If "Nothing is more real than an emotional reaction," it is also true that when emotions are whipped up the actual stuff of controversy may often be amazingly thin. Assuredly slavery in the territories, represented to be a cardinal factor in the formation of the Republican party, was a constant theme of intersectional bickering, and the same may be said of the fugitive slave issue. Remembering this, it is ironical to note how these "issues" were not only less of a stickling point than agitators represented them to be, but in

practice utterly insignificant. If the Civil War was fought because of fugitive slaves or on account of slavery in the West, the American people were miserably hoodwinked by the demon of strife. The census of 1860 numbered escaping slaves at 803, which was approximately one-fiftieth of one per cent of the total number of slaves in the country. By no means all of these eight hundred fugitives escaped to the North, but the number of free Negroes kidnapped in the North and brought South was considerable; thus the actual loss to the South was exceedingly small. . . .

As to the territorial question it is well known that Kansas and Nebraska had been written off for freedom by 1860 for the reason that the Southerners did not care to take slaves into those regions, and that the prospect of slavery taking hold in New Mexico (then including Arizona) was negligible. Federal law permitted slavery in Kansas, but since the census of 1860 showed only two slaves in that territory, which contained a population of over 100,000, it may be truly said that the colossal quarrel concerning slavery in Kansas had practically nothing to do with Kansas itself. Many Republicans said they would not yield on slavery in the territories; but, leaving aside the opportunity of the South to vote down the Republicans by staying in the Union, it is to be repeated that the Republicans themselves dropped the freedom principle as a matter of actual enactment in the Dakota, Colorado, and Nevada laws. Speaking on the eve of Lincoln's inauguration, Douglas asserted in the Senate that the South had, by the action of a Republican Congress, the full right to emigrate into all the territory of the United States, and showed that the Republicans had in fact abandoned their Chicago platform. In the completed legal arrangements of 1860-61 slave interests were given a heavier, not a lighter, weighting than the broad nineteenth-century situation would naturally have provided. Southerners themselves said that sectional agitation had strengthened slavery. Some of them also said that no grievances pertaining to slavery existed which could form a valid basis for disunion.

IX

Sectionalism and the Constitution— The Nature of the Union

WE hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

We, the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

PREAMBLE TO THE CONSTITUTION

CONTENTS

Questions for Study	250
Historical Background	251
Part I: Some Governmental Concepts and Their Ap- plication	253
Part II: The American Compact	265

QUESTIONS FOR STUDY

1. According to Alexander H. Stephens, what was the fallacy in James Madison's and Andrew Jackson's belief that the central and state governments both possessed sovereignty?
2. Although Lincoln and Stephens disagreed completely as to the location of sovereignty in the American union, they seem to have agreed on the essential nature of sovereignty. Explain.
3. To what extent do the selections in Part I, Section C, illustrate the four theories of the origin of the state as enumerated by Leacock?
4. Did Webster accept the contract theory of government? What position was he trying to establish which made it appear at times that he accepted it and at times that he did not?
5. If the Constitution was ratified by the states separately rather than by the people of America collectively, why did not the framers of the Constitution leave the names of the separate states in the Preamble as they had first voted to do?
6. Summarize Alexander H. Stephens' and Albert T. Bledsoe's reasons for denying that "We, the People" meant the people collectively. What contention does Bledsoe add that Stephens does not employ?
7. Of the four theories discussed by Leacock, which appears to have been predominant in American political thought?
8. Of the four theories discussed by Leacock, why was the contract theory intrinsically most favorable to the South? Why was the historical or evolutionary theory most favorable to the North?
9. If a writer were attempting to use this series of Problems in assembling evidence to support the contention either (1) that the American republic originated from contract or (2) that it developed through evolution, which Problems would he rely on especially for each contention? Explain.
10. Even if it be conceded that the union was a compact between sovereign states, how would this justify the right of one of the states to withdraw from the compact and secede from the union?
11. Which of the four theories is most in accord with Kohn's concept of nationalism?
12. The selection from *De Bow's Review* indicates that, although the South as a minority section made free use of the states' rights argument, many of the most ardent southerners were thinking in terms of southern nationalism and not at all in terms of the separate, individual states. Explain.

At noon on December 20, 1860, a convention of delegates representing every portion of the state of South Carolina gathered in St. Andrew's Hall in Charleston. They had first assembled four days earlier and were now met because of the victory of Abraham Lincoln in the Presidential election which had been held in November. Rightly or wrongly, these Carolinians believed that, as an outspoken critic of slavery, Lincoln would menace the security of slave property upon which their plantation economy was based. Believing this, they were nearly all in agreement upon the action which their state ought to take. The routine formality of their parliamentary procedure and their desire to avoid the appearance of haste had delayed action for four days, but they were now prepared to take a decisive step.

Accordingly they received from committee a measure usually known as the South Carolina Ordinance of Secession, and at 1:15 P.M. they unanimously adopted this measure, which read as follows:

"We, the people of the State of South Carolina, in Convention assembled, do declare and ordain, and it is hereby declared and ordained, that the ordinance adopted by us in Convention, on the 23d day of May, in the year of our Lord 1788, whereby the Constitution of the United States of America was ratified, and also all Acts and parts of Acts of the General Assembly of this State ratifying the amendments of the said Constitution, are hereby repealed, and that the union now subsisting between South Carolina and other States under the name of the United States of America is hereby dissolved."

By this act the South Carolina Convention attempted to exercise an asserted right—that of secession—which other states at other times had claimed but which none had ever sought to apply in practice. Now that the Palmetto state took the lead, the other states of the lower South followed during January and February. The Lincoln administration, which took control of the government in March, denied their right to secede, and, as everyone knows, four years of war ensued.

In terms of human life this was the most costly war in the history of the republic; in terms of future growth it was a turning point in American development. The climax of secession and war marked the culmination of a trend toward sectionalism which had been on the increase for more than fifty years. The end of the war marked the complete triumph of nationalistic forces which had previously been held in balance by sectionalism. The victory of the union and of the forces which were supporting it determined the trends which were to dominate and the interests which were to control the country during the fifty years that followed. A century of American history came to climax in this crisis.

In the immediate aftermath of the war the question of the right of secession dominated all treatments of the conflict. If the right did not exist, it seemed to follow that the southern movement was a "Rebellion" in fact as well as in name, that the southern leaders were guilty of treason, and that when Jefferson Davis was imprisoned and shackled after the war, the punishment was less than he deserved. If, on the contrary, secession was valid, then the entire war would appear a vast campaign of imperialistic subjugation, a coercive denial of the principle that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Accordingly, for a generation after the war, few writers could deal with any aspect of the subject without dwelling upon constitutional questions. This was especially true of southern spokesmen, who argued at length and with emphasis that secession rather than slavery or sectionalism had caused the war.

Such emphasis upon the secession question lay open to certain very evident objections. First, it was clear that even states which believed in the right of secession would not have attempted to exercise that right unless other causes of an-

tagonism—social, economic, and political—had alienated them from the union; hence secession was not an underlying cause of conflict. Second, it appeared that the southern movement was really a sectional movement involving an entire region rather than a genuine state-sovereignty movement—that is, Alabama did not secede because of a purpose to reinstate the integrity of Alabama but because it was part of a program, by piecemeal state action, to take the South out of the union; the technique was state action, but the objective was regional action, and secession was but a device. Third, the secession argument was put forward more in the spirit of a lawyer pleading his case than of a philosopher seeking the broadest aspects of truth.

Because of these factors, twentieth-century historians have minimized or ignored the constitutional arguments. An understanding of the process which disrupted the union has seemed more important than the mere vindication and assignment of blame as between the belligerents; and the social and economic factors, such as have been treated in previous Problems, have appeared closer to reality than the fine doctrinal points of constitutional exegesis.

With full allowance for these broader considerations, however, the secession question retains a crucial importance in the history of nationalism and sectionalism. Although secession would not have occurred without the slavery contest, it still remains true that war would not have occurred without secession. The North was not at that time ready to go to war to abolish slavery, and the South was not ready to go to war to extend it into new places. But the South was prepared to fight for the right of secession; even states such as Virginia, which rejected secession as a matter of choice, fought for it as a matter of right. The North was prepared to fight to prevent it. It was only when the irritation generated by the slavery question was translated into a constitutional form that a fighting issue appeared. Secession, then, was the explicit though not the basic cause of the war.

Furthermore, the secession doctrine involved the whole question of what the union meant, just as the territorial issue involved the whole question of slavery. Each was greater than it seemed to be, and it is primarily in this sense that the question will be presented here. South Carolina's Ordinance declared "the Union . . . is dissolved." Lincoln, three months later, asserted "the Union of these States is perpetual . . . the Union is unbroken." This involved diverse understandings of the meaning of union. South Carolina also declared, in a declaration of Causes of Secession similarly adopted by the Convention, that "the State of South Carolina has resumed her position among the nations of the World, as a separate and independent state." Lincoln, after the war began, declared, "no one of our states except Texas ever was a sovereignty. . . . The States have their status in the Union, and they have no other legal status." This involved diverse understandings of the nature of sovereignty in the American system. The diversity is important, not because of any futile argument as to who was right and who was wrong but because sovereignty is the legal concept which attaches to government and because government is the political form in which nationalism expresses itself. To understand how the North and the South conceived of sovereignty, therefore, is to understand how seventy years of developments along dissimilar lines had created in the two sections two opposing concepts of the union under the Constitution.

In Problem II we have already observed that the triumph of the framers of the Constitution was a very skillful division of powers, leaving two levels of government, each one supreme in its own sphere and each possessing powers to deal with the problems of the general level or the local level, as the case might be. The success of this formula had depended upon an ambiguity as to where the ultimate power lay, and the framers had depended upon time and development to resolve the ambiguity. Time and development had, however, not worked uniformly throughout the country; though no one in 1860 regarded the question as still ambiguous, it had been resolved in two conflicting ways.

Part I. SOME GOVERNMENTAL CONCEPTS AND THEIR APPLICATION

Although Jefferson and Hamilton, Webster and Calhoun, Lincoln and Jefferson Davis conducted their disputes always in terms of the American Constitution and other items specifically American, their contentions involved certain basic political questions that are as old as Aristotle. In the explicit form they took these issues are no longer significant, but in their broader relationship they are timeless. It is of advantage, therefore, to approach them in this broader sense.

Fundamental in the nature of every government are the questions of the extent of its authority and of the basis upon which its power is justified. It is a fact so familiar as to be taken for granted that government maintains over the individual powers that would be regarded as criminal in any other hands. It can seize property, conscript the individual, and exercise absolute control over his entire existence or even put him to death. In some governments, of the fascist or communist types, it wields these powers with a minimum of restraint and of formal procedure. In other states, elaborate routines are required to assure, as far as possible, that the power is exercised justly. But in either case the supreme authority is there. Thus authority has always been associated with government, but the nature of the authority and the basis of the authority have varied immeasurably from one government to another. These two aspects of the character of government are in fact inseparably related, but, for purposes of analysis, they may conveniently be considered separately.

A. THE NATURE OF GOVERNMENT: THE QUESTION OF SOVEREIGNTY

The concept of sovereignty is one of the most theoretical in political science and cannot be defined with ease or precision, but Webster offers a convenient general definition: "Sovereignty is the power that determines and administers the government of a state in the final analysis." A full discussion would involve many aspects which cannot be considered here, but the establishment of the American political system after the Revolution presented two features that seemed relatively new in the development of sovereignty. One of these was the concept that sovereignty could be divorced from government and vested in the citizens, so that government did not possess sovereignty, although it exercised sovereign powers. In the old world the sovereign had been the monarch, the ruler; government and sovereignty had been, or had at least seemed, identical. In America they could be regarded as separate. Yet even among people who agreed upon this separateness, the old habit of thought remained strong and many American students of political theory slipped into the practice of regarding a government which exercised sovereign powers as a sovereign government.

A second feature was the concept of a divided sovereignty. In the kingdoms of the old world only one political authority—the central government—ever existed, but in America two authorities operated simultaneously upon every citizen—one was the authority of the state government acting for the people of the state, the other, the authority of the central government acting for the people of America as a whole or for the people of the states as an aggregate. Where authority was divided, it seemed plausible to say that sovereignty was divided.

Accordingly, when Americans discussed sovereignty they were likely to emphasize these ideas: of sovereignty residing in the citizens and only delegated to the government, and of divided sovereignty corresponding to the divided authority in the American system. Some of these concepts, their implications, and their evolution as the sectional crisis approached, may be seen in the comments upon the subject by leading public men.

1. *James Madison's Interpretation.* Madison had gloried in the fact that the American government was mixed, neither purely national nor purely federal (selections from the *Federalist*, pp. 60-62, in Problem II). This idea of mixed government had provided a means of avoiding a decision as to whether the state or the central government was dominant in practice. Similarly his interpretation of sovereignty avoided a decision as to which was dominant in theory, thus again evading a choice which could not have been made without danger to the republic during its formative stage. The interpretation, characteristic of the early period of the republic, appears very clearly in a letter from Madison to Nicholas P. Trist, written somewhat later—February 16, 1830.¹

It has been too much the case in expounding the Constitution of the United States, that its meaning has been sought, not in its peculiar and unprecedented modifications of power, but by viewing it, some through the medium of a simple Government, others through that of a mere league of Governments. It is neither the one nor the other, but essentially different from both. It must, consequently, be its own interpreter. No other Government can furnish a key to its true character. Other Governments present an individual and indivisible sovereignty. The Constitution of the United States divides the sovereignty; the portions surrendered by the States composing the Federal sovereignty over specified subjects; the portions retained forming the sovereignty of each over the residuary subjects within its sphere. If sovereignty cannot be thus divided, the political system of the United States is a chimera, mocking the vain pretensions of human wisdom. If it can be so divided, the system ought to have a fair opportunity of fulfilling the wishes and expectations which cling to the experiment.

2. *Jackson's Formula.* In 1832, when South Carolina asserted her right to nullify or suspend the operation of the federal tariff, Andrew Jackson issued a Proclamation to the People of South Carolina, warning them emphatically that they must not exercise this pretended right and reminding them that the statutes enacted under the Constitution were "the supreme law of the land." In denying the exclusive sovereignty of the state, however, Jackson did not assert the exclusive sovereignty of the central government.²

The States severally have not retained their entire sovereignty. It has been shown that in becoming parts of a nation, not members of a league, they surrendered many of their essential parts of

sovereignty. The right to make treaties, declare war, levy taxes, exercise exclusive judicial and legislative powers, were all of them functions of sovereign power. The States, then, for all these important purposes were no longer sovereign. The allegiance of their citizens was transferred, in the first instance, to the Government of the United States; they became American citizens and owed obedience to the Constitution of the United States and to laws made in conformity with the powers it vested in Congress. This last position has not been and can not be denied. How, then, can that State be said to be sovereign and independent whose citizens owe obedience to laws not made by it and whose magistrates are sworn to disregard those laws when they come in conflict with those passed by another?

3. *Mr. Justice Story Speaks.* Even before Jackson's Proclamation the doctrine of divided sovereignty had begun to seem vulnerable in the light of a logic that will appear in the next selection. Yet adherents of this interpretation were very reluctant to relinquish it. Their attempt to modify their position without really abandoning it led to a certain degree of confusion, which is evident in Joseph Story's treatment of the subject in his *Commentaries on the Constitution* (1833). Story was a Justice of the Supreme Court, receiving his appointment at the age of thirty-two and serving for thirty-four years. He was a disciple of John Marshall and after Marshall's death the principal spokesman of nationalism in the judiciary. With the notable exception of the *Federalist*, his *Commentaries* were regarded as the first great treatise on the Constitution.³

In the first place, antecedent to the Declaration of Independence none of the colonies were, or pretended to be, sovereign states, in the sense in which the term "sovereign" is sometimes applied to states. The term "sovereign" or "sovereignty" is used in different senses, which often leads to a confusion of ideas, and sometimes to very mischievous and unfounded conclusions. By "sovereignty" in its largest sense is meant supreme, absolute, uncontrollable power, the *jus summi imperii*, the absolute right to govern. A state or nation is a body politic, or society of men, united together for the purpose of promoting their mutual safety and advantage by their combined strength. By the very act of civil and political association, each citizen subjects himself to the authority of the whole; and the authority of all over each member essentially belongs to the body politic. A state which possesses this absolute power, without any dependence upon any foreign power or state, is in the largest sense a sovereign state.

And it is wholly immaterial what is the form of the government, or by whose hands this absolute authority is exercised. It may be exercised by the people at large, as in a pure democracy; or by a select few, as in an absolute aristocracy; or by a single person, as in an absolute monarchy. But "sovereignty" is often used in a far more limited sense than that of which we have spoken, to designate such political powers as in the actual organization of the particular state or nation are to be exclusively exercised by certain public functionaries, without the control of any superior authority. . . .

The sovereignty of a nation or state, considered with reference to its association, as a body politic, may be absolute and uncontrollable in all respects, except the limitations which it chooses to impose upon itself. But the sovereignty of the government organized within the state may be of a very limited nature. It may extend to few or to many objects. It may be unlimited as to some, it may be restrained as to others. To the extent of the power given, the government may be sovereign, and its acts may be deemed the sovereign acts of the state. Nay, the state, by which we mean the people composing the state, may divide its sovereign powers among various functionaries, and each in the limited sense would be sovereign in respect to the powers confided to each, and dependent in all other cases. Strictly speaking, in our republican forms of government the absolute sovereignty of the nation is in the people of the nation; and the residuary sovereignty of each State, not granted to any of its public functionaries, is in the people of the State.

4. *A Later Southern View.* The three selections preceding have indicated an interpretation of sovereignty which prevailed almost universally in the first forty years of the republic and which enjoyed wide acceptance even later. But the sectional debates of the 1830s began to popularize another interpretation. This new concept, rejecting the view of Madison and the moderates, was taken up by both northern and southern leaders, who disagreed completely as to where sovereignty resided but agreed that it did not reside in more than one place. One of the best expressions of the new view is found in a book written after the Civil War by Alexander H. Stephens, entitled *A Constitutional View of the Late War between the States* (1868). Stephens had been a Whig Congressman from Georgia and later Vice President of the Southern Confederacy. Like Plato's *Republic* his treatise was written in the form of a dialogue.⁴

PROFESSOR NORTON. Mr. Stephens, will you allow me to ask what you mean by Sovereignty, and

ultimate Sovereignty, and Paramount authority, terms which you have frequently used; but I do not know if I get the exact ideas you intend to convey by them. It has occurred to me as you have progressed in your argument, that a State or Nation might part absolutely with some of her Sovereign powers, and yet retain others, and that this was what our States really did in the formation of the present Constitution. May not the States be fully Sovereign for some purposes, but not for all? May they not be Sovereign over such subjects only as are reserved to them by the Constitution, and the Federal Government be absolutely Sovereign as to all others?

MR. STEPHENS. I perceive your meaning. It involves the idea of a divisibility of Sovereignty itself. It is essential that we shall first clearly understand the real import of this word in its proper political sense. I will therefore answer you, first, by stating as distinctly as I can, what I mean by Sovereignty in this connection. It is a word the meaning of which I supposed was well enough understood for our purposes. It is true, we have no very clear or accurate definition of it, by any political writer or publicist, that I have seen. Most of them have given their ideas of it by explanations and description.

By Sovereignty and Paramount authority I mean the same thing. If I were to undertake to express my ideas of it in regular formula, I should say that Sovereignty or Paramount authority, in a proper political sense, is that inherent, absolute power of self-determination, in every distinct political body, existing by virtue of its own social forces, which, in pursuit of the well-being of its own organism, within the limitations of natural justice, cannot be rightfully interfered with by any other similar body, without its consent. With this explanation, in answer to your view, I have only to add, that Sovereignty, as I understand it, is that innate attribute of the Political Body so possessing it, which corresponds with the *will* and power of self action in the personal body, and by its very nature is indivisible; just as much so as the *Mind* is in the individual organism.

This is the doctrine clearly taught by all writers of note on the subject, in both ancient and modern times. Hence, no Political Body can be absolutely Sovereign for any purpose, and not Sovereign for all purposes which lie within the domain of Sovereignty itself. Bodies-Politic may, by delegation, exercise certain Sovereign powers for some purposes and not for all. This is the case with all Conventional States. We must, moreover, discriminate between the powers of Sovereignty and Sovereignty itself. Sovereign powers are divisible. The exercise of them in all good Governments has been and is entrusted by delegation to different hands; such as the Executive Power, the

Legislative Power, the Judicial Power. These are all high Sovereign powers committed to separate and distinct hands. Sovereignty itself, however, from which they all emanate, remains meanwhile the same indivisible unit. This is the Trinity in Unity exhibited in all properly constituted Representative Governments. Nor is the delegation to another of the right to exercise a power of any kind, whether Sovereign or not, an alienation of it. The fact of its being delegated, shows that the source from which the delegation proceeds continues to exist.

In our system, or united systems, Sovereign powers are not only divided into three great branches, as I have stated, both in the Federal Government and in the several State Governments; but they are also divided in like manner between these two systems of Governments. Some of the Sovereign powers are delegated to all the States to be exercised jointly by them in Congress assembled, as well as by special officers of the Federal Government; and some of them are delegated to the various officers of the several State Governments. Those delegated to each, being delegated by the Sovereign power of the people of the several States separately; and divided similarly in each case. There is no alienation of any portion of Sovereignty itself in either case. This continues to reside with the people of the several States as separate, integral units. I have only further to add in answer to your inquiry, that by *ultimate* Sovereignty in this argument, I mean that original, inherent, innate and continually existing rightful Power, or *Will* of the several Bodies Politic, or States of our Union—that source and fountain of all political power—which is unimpaired by voluntarily assumed obligations; and which at any time, within the terms stated, can rightfully resume all its delegated powers—those to the Federal Government as well as those to the several State Governments.

5. *A Later Northern View.* It was not southerners alone who between 1840 and 1860 rejected the views of Madison, Jackson, and Story as to the place of sovereignty in the balance between state and central governments. The earlier view was also rejected in the North, and while the North did not produce commentators who discussed the question abstractly, as did Stephens, the views of Abraham Lincoln at the time of his war message of July 4, 1861, will indicate that if he agreed with Stephens in nothing else, at least he agreed in disagreeing with Madison. In preparing his First Inaugural Address Lincoln had used only three documents—the Constitution, Webster's reply to Hayne, and

Jackson's Proclamation to the People of South Carolina; but a comparison of Lincoln's views with Jackson's Proclamation, as shown in selection 2, will indicate that he was not a follower of Jackson's interpretation of sovereignty. Nor did he follow Webster, as the reader can see by comparing the text below⁵ with the selections from Webster's reply to Hayne on p. 263.

Our States have neither more nor less power than that reserved to them in the Union by the Constitution—no one of them ever having been a State *out* of the Union. The original ones passed into the Union even *before* they cast off their British colonial dependence; and the new ones each came into the Union directly from a condition of dependence, excepting Texas. And even Texas, in its temporary independence, was never designated a State. The new ones only took the designation of States on coming into the Union, while that name was first adopted for the old ones in and by the Declaration of Independence. Therein the "United Colonies" were declared to be "free and independent States;" but, even then, the object plainly was not to declare their independence of *one another*, or of the *Union*, but directly the contrary, as their mutual pledge, and their mutual action, before, at the time, and afterwards, abundantly show. The express plighting of faith by each and all of the original thirteen in the Articles of Confederation, two years later, that the Union shall be perpetual, is most conclusive. Having never been States, either in substance or in name, *outside* of the Union, whence this magical omnipotence of "State Rights," asserting a claim of power to lawfully destroy the Union itself? Much is said about the "sovereignty" of the States; but the word, even, is not in the National Constitution, nor, as is believed, in any of the State constitutions. What is "sovereignty" in the political sense of the term? Would it be far wrong to define it "a political community without a political superior"? Tested by this, no one of our States, except Texas, ever was a sovereignty. And even Texas gave up the character on coming into the Union; by which act she acknowledged the Constitution of the United States and the laws and treaties of the United States made in pursuance of the Constitution to be, for her, the supreme law of the land. The States have their *status* in the Union, and they have no other legal *status*. If they break from this, they can only do so against law and by revolution. The Union, and not themselves separately, procured their independence and their liberty. By conquest, or purchase, the Union gave each of them whatever of independence and liberty it has. The Union is

older than any of the States, and, in fact, it created them as States. Originally some dependent colonies made the Union, and, in turn, the Union threw

off their old dependence for them, and made them States, such as they are.

B. THE NATURE OF GOVERNMENT: THEORIES OF THE SOURCE OF POLITICAL AUTHORITY

By 1860 southern and northern spokesmen alike had rejected the concept of a divided sovereignty and had agreed that the ultimate power must lie either with the nation collectively or with the states individually, though they disagreed in their choice of alternatives. To a great many Americans this choice of the ultimate loyalty was no theoretical abstraction but a most fateful and painful decision, sometimes involving loss of home and alienation from friends and family. With two governments commanding their obedience, they must have given more thought than men ordinarily do to the underlying question how any person could incur such vital obligations to a political organization. At various times in world history men have held a number of different views as to what it is that gives the government authority to command the citizen. The views that prevailed in 1860 can best be understood in terms of the general history of thought on the subject, and for this reason it will be to our advantage to approach the problem through a historical survey of influential theories of the origins of the state. These theories are conveniently summarized in a discussion by Stephen Leacock.⁶

. . . the topic which of necessity takes the first place in our inquiry is that of the origin of the state. How has it come about that men are everywhere found living under some form of authoritative control? What is the origin of government and law? Speculation as to the beginnings of government is not merely a matter of historical curiosity, for it is intimately associated with the more important question of the justification of government,—the right of the state to be. The present subject thus brings before us both a historical and an ethical enquiry,—the investigation of the facts as to the actual beginnings of political forms and the discussion of the bearing of these facts on the question of the rightfulness or wrongness of the existence of government.

To examine and reject a fallacious hypothesis is often a means of arriving at the truth. In the present instance a presentation of some of the mistaken theories proposed as to the origin of the state may aid us in moving towards a correct one. The different opinions which we shall briefly review have had such great influence in the formation of existing political institutions that a proper understanding of them is necessary in order to appreciate the forces operative in the growth and structure of modern governments. The purpose of the ensuing discussion is not, therefore, the merely sophistical task of demolishing hypotheses of straw. The rejection of what is false in the speculative theories of the past will aid in establishing more valid conclusions on the residual basis of what is true.

(1) Foremost in historical importance of all the

different views concerning the origin of the state, is the theory of the social contract. As old as political speculation itself, and preëminent in its influence, it stands written large upon the history of human thought. . . . It professes to offer an explanation of the origin and justification of government. To do this it starts from the fundamental assumption that the past history of mankind may be divided into two periods, the first of which is antecedent to the institution of government, the latter subsequent to it. During the first of these periods, man is found in the "state of nature," uncontrolled by any laws of human imposition, and subject only to such regulations as are supposed to be prescribed to him by nature itself. This code of regulations, or rather, since it is nowhere written down, the spirit by which such a code might be presumed to be inspired, is spoken of as the law of nature, or natural law.

This primitive stage of natural society man is presently compelled to desert. Whether it be that this state is too idyllic to last, or whether it becomes in the course of time and by reason of mutual rapacity too inconvenient to be tolerated, is a point of dispute among the exponents of the theory themselves. In either case man is led to substitute for it a union with his fellow-men in which, abandoning the isolation of the "natural" individual, all are joined into one civil society or body politic. Each now stands in a vastly different relation to his fellow-men. Submitting himself to the joint control of all, he receives in return the benefit of the joint interest of all in his protection. To safeguard the security of all

members of the body politic (or state), a code of law is enforced by all against the possible rapacity of each.

Thus while each loses the "natural liberty" that he enjoyed in the antecedent state of nature, he gains in return the security to which he is naturally entitled, and which is now guaranteed to him by the covenant of all his fellows. Human law is substituted for a natural law, and the individual in submitting to social duties finds himself clothed with social rights. The process, or at any rate the result of it, has very much the appearance of a contract or bargain dictated by the individual's own interest, an exchange of obligations in return for privileges. Whether the bargain is to be looked upon as one that actually happened at a given time and place for each politically constituted society, or whether it merely expresses the result or outcome of a more gradual social process, is a matter that has been persistently left in a half-light. We cannot therefore make any general statement as to whether those who have defended the idea of the social contract have viewed it as a historical fact, or only as an interpretation of the nature of the social bond. . . .

Of the arguments directed against the social contract the most evident and the most unanswerable is that the theory has no foundation in history. There is no recorded instance of a group of savages, previously without any political organization or political ideas, deliberately meeting together to supply the defect. Nor is it rational to suppose that any such deliberate first creation of the state could have happened; for this presupposes in the minds of its founders the conception of social organization before any such phenomenon had existed. They must have known what a government was before they could make one.

As against this it is urged that history does furnish us instances of what may be termed the formation of a social contract, not indeed among men hitherto ignorant of government, but among groups of people separated from the state under which they had lived, and desirous of forming a new organization by deliberate action. Most famous of these instances is the case of the Puritan emigrants of the Mayflower. The familiar document drawn up and signed by them while still on board ship runs, "we . . . do, by these presents, solemnly and mutually in the presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic, for our better ordering and preservation." "When Carlyle objects," says Professor Ritchie, "that Jean Jacques could not fix the date of the social contract, it would at least be a plausible retort to say that the date was the 11th of November, 1620."

Further examples are found during the same era of American history in the Providence agreement (1636) and the plantation covenant of New Haven (1638). It has been urged that the written constitutions of the United States and its component commonwealths are historical instances of social contracts. But in all of these cases we have at best not the institution of a state among a people hitherto devoid of political organization, but the establishment of a particular government by persons already accustomed to the rights and duties of civil society. If the social-contract theory merely meant that in some cases particular governments are established by joint and general action, it would be hard to contradict it.

It is, however, possible to abandon the doctrine of the social contract as representing a historical occurrence, and yet to adhere to it as expressing the proper interpretation of the relations between the individual and the state. Viewed in this light it is no longer a historical but an analytical conception. It proposes as the justification of the state a voluntary exchange of services between the individual and the political community. The individual renders obedience and receives protection. It is in this form that we find the contract doctrine maintained by many political philosophers of the early nineteenth century. Such for instance is the standpoint of Kant. The contract, he says, is "not to be assumed as a historical fact, for as such it is not possible, but it is a rational idea which has its practical reality in that the legislator may so order his laws as if they were the outcome of a social contract. The latter becomes in consequence 'the criterion of the equity of every public law.'"

Yet even as an ideal of social relations, the contract doctrine has been assailed, one may say almost overwhelmed, with hostile criticism. The individual, it is argued, is joined to the state not by a voluntary conjunction but by an indissoluble bond. The relation is a compulsory one. Each of us is born into the state; we are part of the state and the state is part of us. The state is not a mutual assurance society, membership in which is a matter that the citizen may accept or reject. Nor is the true measure of our social duties to be found in the extent of benefit that we receive from society. Our common experience of the nature of the state indicates much that conflicts with the narrow view suggested by the *quid pro quo* of a contract relation. Patriotism—the sacrifice of the individual's interests to the claims of the community—we account one of the highest of virtues. We look to the state as the especial guardian of the poor and the helpless. We call upon it to act not for the present generation alone, but for the welfare of those which are to come. The state, in fine, stands in its ideal aspect for

the collective moral effort of the whole community. . . .

(2) The theory of the divine origin, known in familiar form as "the divine right of kings," may now be regarded as entirely extinct in political theory. It belongs especially to the period of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Originating after the great mediaeval controversy of the Papacy and Empire had subsided, it represents the resistance offered by the constituted monarchical governments to the growing ideas of popular sovereignty. Its essential meaning is that each and every existing state represents an institution of deliberate divine creation. Under this theory the government, or one may say the monarch, since the doctrine was directed towards the defense of the monarchical system, represents a direct divine agency against whom no supposed principle of individual rights can be valid. In a certain sense it is of course very generally held that all human institutions represent the controlling power of the Deity. But the theory of divine right goes much farther than this. It assumes the Deity to have vested political power in a special way, and by special intervention, and to have seen fit to deny political supremacy to the mass of the community. . . .

(3) [Also] . . . we may mention among the erroneous doctrines in explanation of the origin and meaning of the state the theory of force. Here, again, the same theory appears both as a historical interpretation of the rise of the state and as a rational justification of its being. Historically it means that government is the outcome of human aggression, that the beginnings of the state are to be sought in the capture and enslavement of man by man, in the conquest and subjugation of the feebler tribes, and, generally speaking, in the self-seeking domination acquired by superior physical force. The progressive growth from tribe to kingdom, and from kingdom to empire, is but a continuation of the same process. . . .

We find the theory of force elaborated in detail by Marx, Engels, and the writers of the German socialistic group. Here the doctrine assumes a slightly different form. The growth of the state is to be attributed to the process of aggressive exploitation, by means of which a part of the

community has succeeded in defrauding their fellows of the just reward of their labor. Existing governments represent merely the coercive organization which serves to hold the workers in bondage. The socialist writers have no fault to find with the abstract existence of a state or coercive authority. Their objection is directed against the particular form of the present state, which they ascribe to its iniquitous historical origin. As against the theory of force in general it can with propriety be advanced that it errs in magnifying what has been only one factor in the evolution of society, into the sole controlling force. That government has in part been founded on aggression no one will readily deny. But as we shall presently see, its institution has owed much to forces of an entirely different character. . . .

(4) [A fourth theory is] . . . the historical or evolutionary theory of the state. By this is meant that the institution of the state is not to be referred back to any single point of time; it is not the outcome of any single movement or plan. The state is not an invention: it is a growth, an evolution, the result of a gradual process running throughout all the known history of man, and receding into the remote and unknown past. "The proposition that the State is a product of history," says Professor Burgess, "means that it is a gradual and continuous development of human society out of a grossly imperfect beginning through crude but improving forms of manifestation towards a perfect and universal organization of mankind." It is thus altogether erroneous to think of man as having in the course of his evolution attained to a full physical and mental development, and then looking about him to consider the advisability of inventing a government. We might as well imagine man, mentally and physically complete, deciding that the time had come for the invention of language, in order to satisfy his growing need for communicating with his fellows. Just as language has been evolved from the uncouth gibberings of animals, so has government had its origins in remote and rudimentary beginnings in prehistoric society. Man's capacity for associated action and social relationships of all kinds has proceeded by a gradual development parallel with that of his physical and intellectual aptitudes.

C. AMERICAN APPLICATIONS OF THEORIES AS TO THE SOURCE OF POLITICAL AUTHORITY

As Leacock states the various theories of the source of governmental authority, they are abstract concepts. But every reader will readily be reminded of examples that illustrate the various theories. Louis XIV clearly adhered to one of these views, Hitler to another, Thomas Jefferson to a third. The American system has usually been explained and justified by only one of the four, but others may be applied to it. As a practical illustration of

the way in which general theories can be applied to concrete cases, it may be well to examine a series of interpretations of the source of authority of the American government. The student will observe that the first three correspond more or less to three of the interpretations in Leacock, and that the third through the sixth present diverse applications of a single one of them.

1. *Seward on the Union.* During the most heated period of the slavery controversy William H. Seward repeatedly set forth his own explanation of the ultimate force behind the American union. His speeches avoided theoretical and speculative reasoning and stressed a realistic interpretation. The extracts which illustrate his views are from speeches in the Senate, March 11, 1850 and February 29, 1860.⁷

[*Senate Speech, March 11, 1850*]

Even senators speak of the Union as if it existed only by consent, and, as it seems to be implied, by the assent of the legislatures of the states. On the contrary, the union was not founded in voluntary choice, nor does it exist by voluntary consent.

A union was proposed to the colonies by Franklin and others, in 1754; but such was their aversion to an abridgment of their own importance, respectively, that it was rejected even under the pressure of a disastrous invasion by France.

A union of choice was proposed to the colonies in 1775; but so strong was their opposition, that they went through the war of independence without having established more than a mere council of consultation.

But with independence came enlarged interests of agriculture—absolutely new interests of manufactures—interests of commerce, of fisheries, of navigation, of a common domain, of common debts, of common revenues and taxation, of the administration of justice, of public defence, of public honor; in short, interests of common nationality and sovereignty—interests which at last compelled the adoption of a more perfect union—a National Government. . . .

The Union, the creature of necessities, physical, moral, social, and political, endures by virtue of the same necessities; and these necessities are stronger than when it was produced—stronger by the greater amplitude of territory now covered by it—stronger by the sixfold increase of the society living under its beneficent protection—stronger by the augmentation ten thousand times of the fields, the workshops, the mines, and the ships, of that society; of its productions of the sea, of the plow, of the loom, and of the anvil, in their constant circle of internal and international exchange—stronger in the long rivers penetrating regions before unknown—stronger in all the artificial roads, canals, and other channels and avenues essential not only to trade but to defence—stronger

in steam navigation, in steam locomotion on the land, and in telegraph communications, unknown when the Constitution was adopted—stronger in the freedom and in the growing empire of the seas—stronger in the element of national honor in all lands, and stronger than all in the now settled habits of veneration and affection for institutions so stupendous and so useful.

The Union, then, is, not because merely that men chose that it shall be, but because some government must exist here, and no other government than this can. If it could be dashed to atoms by the whirlwind, the lightning, or the earthquake, to-day, it would rise again in all its just and magnificent proportions to-morrow. This nation is a globe, still accumulating upon accumulation, not a dissolving sphere.

[*Senate Speech, February 29, 1860*]

I remain now in the opinion I have uniformly expressed here and elsewhere, that these hasty threats of disunion are so unnatural that they will find no hand to execute them. We are of one race, language, liberty and faith, engaged, indeed, in varied industry; but even that industry, so diversified, brings us into more intimate relations with each other than any other people, however homogeneous, and though living under a consolidated government, ever maintained. We languish throughout, if one joint of our federal frame is smitten; while it is certain that a part severed must perish. You may refine as you please about the structure of the government, and say that it is a compact, and that a breach, by one of the states or by congress, of any one article, absolves all the members from allegiance, and that the states may separate when they have, or fancy they have, cause for war. But once try to subvert it, and you will find that it is a government of the whole people—as individuals, as well as a compact of states; that every individual member of the body politic is conscious of his interest and power in it, and knows that he will be helpless, powerless, hopeless, when it shall have gone down.

Mankind have a natural right, a natural instinct, and a natural capacity for self-government, and when, as here, they are sufficiently ripened by culture, they will and must have self-government, and no other. The framers of our constitution, with a wisdom that surpassed all previous understanding among men, adapted it to these inherent elements of human nature. He strangely, blindly,

misunderstands the anatomy of the great system who thinks that its only bonds, or even its strongest ligaments, are the written compact or even the multiplied and thoroughly ramified roads and thoroughfares of trade, commerce and social intercourse. These are strong indeed; but its chiefest instruments of cohesion—those which render it inseparable and indivisible—are the millions of fibres of millions of contented, happy human hearts, binding by their affections, their ambitions and their best hopes, equally the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the wise and the unwise, the learned and the untutored, even the good and the bad, to a government, the first, the last, and the only such one that has ever existed, which takes equal heed always of their wants, their wishes and their opinions; and appeals to them all, individually, once in a year, or two years, or at least in four years, for their expressed consent and renewal, without which it must cease.

2. *An Editor's Explanation.* The origin of the American union was presented thus in an editorial in the *Morning Courier and New York Enquirer* of January 8, 1861.⁸

During the past century, the progress of the world in the science of government, has been immeasurably greater than at any previous period; but the seeds of such progress, are to be found in the mysterious workings of that Providence which is ever shaping the destinies of man, and gradually preparing him for a higher development than he has yet attained. The discovery of the New World and the Reformation, apparently had no connection; and yet, when as the consequence of that reformation, our fathers sought asylums from religious persecution, God in His Providence, had provided for them a home on this side of the Atlantic. Here, *Protestantism* planted itself in the wilds and solitudes of a savage wilderness; and fleeing as it did, from Religious persecutions in the Old World, the natural fruits of that planting, were Civil and Religious liberty. It is only necessary to look at the history of those who settled in this, then unbroken wilderness and in the midst of a savage foe, to recognize the hand of God in their preservation from destruction and in their subsequent growth; and none but an Infidel can fail to discover in our subsequent history, the all wise purposes of that great Being, without whose permission not even a sparrow falls to the earth, and in whose hands are the destinies of all mankind. . . .

He subjected our fathers to the sacrifices, the hardships and the privations of a seven years' struggle with the mightiest nation of the earth; and in the school of adversity and suffering, He prepared them for His work. And that was, no

other than the establishment of our present Government—the *Union of these States*—intended to secure to our fathers, to us, and to our descendants forever, the blessings of Civil and Religious Liberty, and to become, not only an asylum, but a beacon light to the oppressed of the Old World, teaching by our example, the ability of man for self-government and the necessity of his preparing himself for the task, by gradual emancipation and the blessings of education.

3. *Jefferson's Opinion, 1798.* A third explanation of the origin of the American union, quite unlike either of the two preceding, was set forth by Thomas Jefferson in a series of resolutions which he wrote in 1798 for adoption by the Kentucky legislature and which are known accordingly as the Kentucky Resolutions. The reason for the passage of these resolutions was that the federalist administration of President John Adams had enacted the Alien and Sedition Laws, which undertook to suppress sedition but seemed to the Jeffersonians to suppress freedom of speech despite Constitutional guarantees. If the government was, as Jefferson assumed, violating the Constitution, this raised the question whether the authority of government rested upon any basis which could justify demands for obedience by members of the union. Jefferson's treatment of the question showed very definitely which of the four theories of political authority he accepted; it is also important in this Problem because it became one of the key items in the development of the secession doctrine.⁹

Resolved, That the several states composing the United States of America are not united on the principle of unlimited submission to their general government; but that, by compact, under the style and title of a Constitution for the United States, and of amendments thereto, they constituted a general government for special purposes, delegated to that government certain definite powers, reserving, each state to itself, the residuary mass of right to their own self-government; and that whensoever the general government assumes undelegated powers, its acts are unauthorized, void, and of no force; that to this compact each state acceded as a state, and is an integral party; that this government, created by this compact, was not made the exclusive or final judge of the extent of the powers delegated to itself, since that would have made its discretion, and not the Constitution, the measure of its powers; but that, as in all other cases of compact among parties having no common judge, *each party has an equal right to judge for itself, as well of infractions as of the mode and measure of redress.*

4. *A Confederate Elaboration.* Jefferson's interpretation of this authority for the government of the union was maintained and elaborated by numerous southern leaders, who developed it with increasing emphasis as the secession crisis approached. Its mature form is well represented by a set of propositions in which the Confederate president Jefferson Davis stated his position.¹⁰

Looking back for a moment at the ground over which we have gone, I think it may be fairly asserted that the following propositions have been clearly and fully established:

1. That the states of which the American union was formed, from the moment when they emerged from their colonial or provincial condition, became severally sovereign, free, and independent States—not one State, or nation.

2. That the union formed under the Articles of Confederation was a compact between the States, in which these attributes of "sovereignty, freedom, and independence," were expressly asserted and guaranteed.

3. That, in forming the "more perfect union" of the Constitution, afterward adopted, the same contracting powers formed an *amended compact*, without any surrender of these attributes of sovereignty, freedom, and independence, either expressed or implied: on the contrary, that, by the tenth amendment to the Constitution, limiting the power of the Government to its express grants, they distinctly guarded against the presumption of a surrender of anything by implication.

4. That political sovereignty resides, neither in individual citizens, nor in unorganized masses, nor in fractional subdivisions of a community, but in the people of an organized political body.

5. That no "republican form of government," in the sense in which that expression is used in the Constitution, and was generally understood by the founders of the Union—whether it be the government of a State or of a confederation of States—is possessed of any sovereignty whatever, but merely exercises certain powers delegated by the sovereign authority of the people, and subject to recall and reassumption by the same authority that conferred them.

6. That the "people" who organized the first confederation, the people who dissolved it, the people who ordained and established the Constitution which succeeded it, the only people, in fine, known or referred to in the phraseology of that period—whether the term was used collectively or distributively—were the people of the respective States, each acting separately and with absolute independence of the others.

7. That, in forming and adopting the Constitution, the States, or the people of the States—

terms which, when used with reference to acts performed in a sovereign capacity, are precisely equivalent to each other—formed a new *Government*, but no new *people*; and that, consequently, no new sovereignty was created—for sovereignty in an American republic can belong only to a people, never to a government—and that the Federal Government is entitled to exercise only the powers delegated to it by the people of the respective States.

8. That the term "people," in the preamble to the Constitution and in the tenth amendment, is used distributively; that the only "people of the United States" known to the Constitution are the people of each State in the Union; that no such political community or corporate unit as one people of the United States then existed, has ever been organized, or yet exists; that no political action by the people of the United States in the aggregate has ever taken place, or ever can take place, under the Constitution.

The fictitious idea of *one* people of the United States, contradicted in the last paragraph, has been so impressed upon the popular mind by false teaching, by careless and vicious phraseology, and by the ever-present spectacle of a great Government, with its army and navy, its custom-houses and post-offices, its multitude of office-holders, and the splendid prizes which it offers to political ambition, that the tearing away of these illusions and presentation of the original fabric, which they have overgrown and hidden from view, have no doubt been unwelcome, distasteful, and even repellent to some of my readers. The artificial splendor which makes the deception attractive is even employed as an argument to prove its reality.

5. *Webster's Theses.* The two preceding selections from Thomas Jefferson and Jefferson Davis indicate that the southern position rested definitely on one and only one of the four bases of authority suggested by Leacock. From this one might anticipate, by contrast, that the northern view rejected this basis. But here one must recall that all elements and all parties agreed on the principles of the Revolution and of the Declaration of Independence. Their disagreement resulted not from dissimilar theories as to the source of political authority but from dissimilar applications of the same theory. A comparison of the statements of northern and southern leaders will reveal significant points of agreement as well as critical points of disagreement.

For the North no one spoke on constitutional questions with more authority than Daniel Webster, who won from admirers the title, "the Great Expounder" of the Constitution and who, from the Webster-Hayne

debate in 1830 until his death in 1852, defended the indivisibility of the union in a series of speeches which furnished an arsenal of arguments for the opponents of state sovereignty. In the extracts which follow it is worth noticing that Webster seems at times to accept the idea that the Constitution is a compact, in the sense of the contract theory as stated by Leacock, and at times he seems to reject it. Why his apparent wavering? Is he simply inconsistent, or is he accepting the Constitution as a compact in one sense of the word and rejecting it in another? Does he accept the contract theory in the sense in which Leacock presents it? Does he accept it in the sense used by the Kentucky Resolutions and Jefferson Davis? The selections are from his reply to Hayne, January 1830, from a Senate speech in 1833, and from a speech at Capon Springs, Virginia, June 1851.¹¹

[From the Reply to Hayne]

[Webster is commenting on the disproportionately large representation which the southern states secured through the counting of three fifths of the slaves] Nevertheless, I do not complain; nor would I countenance any movement to alter this arrangement of representation. It is the original bargain, the compact; let it stand; let the advantage of it be fully enjoyed. The Union itself is too full of benefit to be hazarded in propositions for changing its original basis. I go for the Constitution as it is, and for the Union as it is. But I am resolved not to submit in silence to accusations, either against myself individually or against the North, wholly unfounded and unjust; accusations which impute to us a disposition to evade the constitutional compact, and to extend the power of the government over the internal laws and domestic condition of the States.

[From Another Part of the Reply to Hayne]

This leads us to inquire into the origin of this government and the source of its power. Whose agent is it? . . . It is, Sir, the people's Constitution, the people's government, made for the people, made by the people, and answerable to the people. The people of the United States have declared that this Constitution shall be the supreme law. We must either admit the proposition, or dispute their authority. The States are, unquestionably, sovereign, so far as their sovereignty is not affected by this supreme law. . . . So far as the people have given power to the general government, so far the grant is unquestionably good, and the government holds of the people, and not of the State governments. We are all agents of the same supreme power, the people. The general government and the State

governments derive their authority from the same source.

[From a Senate Speech of January 22, 1833]

[Webster is speaking in opposition to resolutions by Calhoun, that "The political system under which we live . . . is a compact to which the people of the several states, as separate and sovereign communities, are the parties"] On entering into the Union, the people of each State gave up a part of their own power to make laws for themselves, in consideration that, as to common objects, they should have a part in making laws for other States. In other words, the people of all the States agreed to create a common government, to be conducted by common counsels. Pennsylvania, for example, yielded the right of laying imposts in her own ports, in consideration that the new government, in which she was to have a share, should possess the power of laying imposts on all the States. If South Carolina now refuses to submit to this power, she breaks the condition on which other States entered into the Union. . . .

I do not agree that the Constitution is a compact between States in their sovereign capacities. I do not agree, that, in strictness of language, it is a compact at all. But I do agree that it is founded on consent or agreement, or on compact, if the gentleman prefers that word, and means no more by it than voluntary consent or agreement. The Constitution, Sir, is not a contract, but the result of a contract; meaning by contract no more than assent. Founded on consent, it is a government proper. Adopted by the agreement of the people of the United States, when adopted, it has become a Constitution. The people have agreed to make a Constitution; but when made, that Constitution becomes what its name imports. It is no longer a mere agreement. . . .

The Constitution of the United States, founded in or on the consent of the people, may be said to rest on compact or consent; but it is not itself the compact, but its result. When the people agree to erect a government, and actually erect it, the thing is done, and the agreement is at an end. . . . Henceforth, the fruit of the agreement exists, but the agreement itself is merged in its own accomplishment. . . .

[Calhoun took notes on this speech of Webster's, and according to these notes Webster said, "a man is almost untrue to his country who calls the Constitution a compact." Calhoun attributed the statement to Webster in a speech on February 26 and Webster did not challenge him.]

[Later in the Same Speech]

Indeed, Sir, if we look to all contemporary history, to the numbers of the Federalist, to the debates in the conventions. to the publications of

friends and foes, they all agree, that a change had been made from a confederacy of States to a different system; they all agree, that the Convention had formed a Constitution for a national government. With this result some were satisfied, and some were dissatisfied; but all admitted that the thing had been done. In none of these various productions and publications did any one intimate that the new Constitution was but another compact between States in their sovereign capacities. I do not find such an opinion advanced in a single instance.

Everywhere, the people were told that the old Confederation was to be abandoned, and a new system to be tried; that a proper government was proposed, to be founded in the name of the people, and to have a regular organization of its own. Everywhere, the people were told that it was to be a government with direct powers to make laws over individuals, and to lay taxes and impose without the consent of the States. Everywhere, it was understood to be a popular Constitution. It came to the people for their adoption, and was to rest on the same deep foundation as the State constitutions themselves. Its most distinguished advocates, who had been themselves members of the Convention, declared that the very object of submitting the Constitution to the people was, to preclude the possibility of its being regarded as a mere compact. "However gross a heresy," say the writers of the *Federalist*, "it may be to maintain that a party to a compact has a right to revoke that compact, the doctrine itself has had respectable advocates. The possibility of a question of this nature proves the necessity of laying the foundations of our national government deeper than in the mere sanction of delegated authority. The fabric of American empire ought to rest on the solid basis of THE CONSENT OF THE PEOPLE."

Such is the language, Sir, addressed to the people, while they yet had the Constitution under consideration. The powers conferred on the new government were perfectly well understood to be conferred, not by any State, or the people of any State, but by the people of the United States. Virginia is more explicit, perhaps, in this particular, than any other State. Her convention, assembled to ratify the Constitution, "in the name and behalf of the people of Virginia, declare and make known, that the powers granted under the Constitution, *being derived from the people of the United States*, may be resumed by them whenever the same shall be perverted to their injury or oppression."

Is this language which describes the formation of a compact between States? or language describing the grant of powers to a new govern-

ment, by the whole people of the United States?

Among all the other ratifications, there is not one which speaks of the Constitution as a compact between States. Those of Massachusetts and New Hampshire express the transaction, in my opinion, with sufficient accuracy. They recognize the Divine goodness "in affording THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES an opportunity of entering into an explicit and solemn compact with each other, *by assenting to and ratifying a new Constitution.*" You will observe, Sir, that it is the PEOPLE, and not the States, who have entered into this compact; and it is the PEOPLE of all the United States. These conventions, by this form of expression, meant merely to say, that the people of the United States had, by the blessing of Providence, enjoyed the opportunity of establishing a new Constitution, *founded in the consent of the people*. This consent of the people has been called, by European writers, the *social compact*; and, in conformity to this common mode of expression, these conventions speak of that assent, on which the new Constitution was to rest, as an explicit and solemn compact, not which the States had entered into with each other, but which the *people* of the United States had entered into.

Finally, Sir, how can any man get over the words of the Constitution itself?—"WE, THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, DO ORDAIN, AND ESTABLISH THIS CONSTITUTION." These words must cease to be a part of the Constitution, they must be obliterated from the parchment on which they are written, before any human ingenuity or human argument can remove the popular basis on which that Constitution rests, and turn the instrument into a mere compact between sovereign States.

[From the Speech at Capon Springs, Virginia]

[Webster was assuring his Southern auditors that he accepted the Constitutional obligation that fugitive slaves must be returned] How absurd it is to suppose that when different parties enter into a compact for certain purposes, either can disregard any one provision, and nevertheless expect the other to observe the rest! I intend for one to regard, and maintain, and carry out, to the fullest extent, the Constitution of the United States, which I have sworn to support in all its parts and all its provisions. . . .

I have not hesitated to say, and I repeat, that if the Northern States refuse, wilfully and deliberately, to carry into effect that part of the Constitution which respects the restoration of fugitive slaves, and Congress provide no remedy, the South would no longer be bound to observe the compact.

6. *Lincoln's Philosophy.* From the nationalist standpoint no one's interpretation of the ultimate political authority was more important than Abraham Lincoln's. This Problem has already shown that Lincoln did not follow anyone—not even Jackson and Webster—on the question of divided sovereignty. Did he follow the great unionist spokesmen of the earlier period in their acceptance of the doctrine of compact? A study of all of Lincoln's political utterances shows that he discussed this topic very seldom and never in the most explicit terms. He probably wished to avoid refined arguments as to the application of the doctrine. Some of his political declarations, however, do show very clearly where his choice lay among the four doctrines on Leacock's list. The selection is from his First Inaugural Address, March 4, 1861.¹²

Again, if the United States be not a government proper, but an association of States in the nature of contract merely, can it, as a contract, be peaceably unmade by less than all the parties who made it? One party to a contract may violate it—break it, so to speak; but does it not require all to lawfully rescind it?

Descending from these general principles, we find the proposition that, in legal contemplation, the Union is perpetual, confirmed by the history of the Union itself. The Union is much older than the Constitution. It was formed, in fact, by the Articles of Association in 1774. It was matured and continued by the Declaration of Independence in 1776. It was further matured and the faith of all the then thirteen States expressly

plighted and engaged that it should be perpetual, by the Articles of Confederation in 1778. And finally, in 1787 one of the declared objects for ordaining and establishing the Constitution was "*to form a more perfect Union.*"

But if [the] destruction of the Union by one, or by a part only, of the States, be lawfully possible, the Union is *less* perfect than before the Constitution, having lost the vital element of perpetuity.

It follows from these views that no State, upon its own mere motion, can lawfully get out of the Union,—that *resolves* and *ordinances* to that effect are legally void, and that acts of violence, within any State or States, against the authority of the United States, are insurrectionary or revolutionary, according to circumstances.

I therefore consider that in view of the Constitution and the laws, the Union is unbroken; and to the extent of my ability I shall take care, as the Constitution itself expressly enjoins upon me, that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the States. Doing this I deem to be only a simple duty on my part; and I shall perform it, so far as practicable, unless my rightful masters, the American people, shall withhold the requisite means, or, in some authoritative manner, direct the contrary. I trust this will not be regarded as a menace, but only as the declared purpose of the Union that it will constitutionally defend and maintain itself. . . .

This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their *constitutional* right of amending it, or their *revolutionary* right to dismember or overthrow it.

Part II.

THE AMERICAN COMPACT

The selections in Part I of this Problem have indicated that despite all controversies over the character and location of sovereignty, the relationship of the states to the union, or the act which had brought the union into being, American thought was undivided in accepting the principle that government derives its rightful authority from agreement and not from evolution, force, or a divine anointment of the chiefs of state. In this sense all accepted the compact theory, and, even though William H. Seward employed arguments inconsistent with it, he would hardly have denied that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." The doctrine of contract was basic to the written constitutions and governments of limited powers which were vital features of the American system. However much it might be construed, interpreted, and twisted, it could not be repudiated.

The doctrine, as we shall have occasion to see, offers an unduly narrow and artificial basis for explaining national existence. But once it is accepted, it enables the investigator immediately to turn away from abstract concepts and theoretical discussion and to grapple with a concrete problem: Where, when, how, and in what form did the governed of America give their consent to the government of the union? By way of answer some held, as did

Lincoln, that the union was older than the Constitution and that it had existed since the association in 1774. Others recalled that the states had retained their full sovereignty under the Articles of Confederation (see pp. 42, 262, above) and argued that the union originated with the Constitution of 1787. Whatever date was assigned, everyone agreed that the most important specific statement of the contract was the Preamble to the Constitution, which declares that "We, the people of the United States . . . do ordain and establish this Constitution." Here the broad abstract problem of union seems to narrow itself to the meaning of a phrase, "We, the People of the United States." Here speculative and universal problems about man in a state of nature are superseded by a severely logical controversy as to the meaning of seven words.

To pursue to its conclusion the argument on the political nature of the union, one must probe for the meaning of this seemingly simple phrase. But in following an argument it is always essential to question not only which contention develops most logically from the premises but whether the premises themselves are valid. Even though champions of the union and the Confederacy agreed that the nature of the union could be ascertained exclusively from the analysis of a phrase written seventy years previously, the twentieth-century student must decide independently what broader factors of social and economic development, apart from verbal formulae, contributed to the forming of the nation.

The South contended that the union had not been a nation in 1787 and was not one in 1860. The North contended that it had been a nation in 1787 and remained one in 1860. The South argued that the union must at last remain what had been at first agreed on; the North argued that whatever the union at last became must have been at first agreed on. The attempt will therefore be made both to establish the facts about the first agreement and to evaluate its adequacy as a definition of the union that existed in 1860. What was the nature of the union in 1787? What was its nature in 1860?

A.

THE UNION IN 1787: "WE, THE PEOPLE"

As Part I of this Problem has shown, the Americans of the Revolutionary and post-Revolutionary period contributed two new views to the concept of sovereignty—it was divisible, and it resided in the people and not in governments. The first of these served a useful purpose in enabling moderates to evade a choice between the supremacy of the union and the supremacy of the states. The second served even more usefully toward the same end; when the theory of divisible sovereignty was abandoned, moderates could still evade a choice between sovereign central government and sovereign state government by asserting that sovereignty lay with neither but with the people. Only an alert critic would be certain to inquire "what people?" As Raymond G. Gettell declares in his *History of American Political Thought*, "By accepting the doctrine that all political authority is derived from the people, without stating whether by 'the people' they meant the citizen bodies of the thirteen states considered separately, or the whole American people conceived as a single body politic, they gave no real answer to the question of the final location of sovereignty in America, but merely pushed the problem one step farther back and left it as undetermined as before."¹⁸

The ultimate question of the American union, therefore, was not the question whether state governments or citizen groups had been parties to its creation, for all agreed that the citizen groups—"the people," alone had exercised this sovereign function. The question was: What citizen groups? One single collective mass of Americans? If so, certainly no state group could later undo what the people collectively had done, and accordingly secession had no standing. Or a number of separate bodies of citizens of diverse states? If the latter, had they in any way transferred sovereignty by their act? Certainly not to the central government, for government does not possess sovereignty in America. Apparently not to the body of American citizens, for the Constitution indicated no such transfer. But, the argument ran, if they had not transferred it to a new government or to a new people, and if they were still sovereign, they retained a right to secede. Few challenged this chain of reasoning. Instead they denied that ratification was the act of separate groups and asserted that it was the act of the people as a whole. Because of this, much of the validity of the secession argument hung upon the meaning of "We, the People."

1. *James Madison's Notes on the Constitutional Convention.* These show the steps by which the framers decided on the method of ratification and the language of the Preamble.¹⁴

[July 23, *In Convention*]

Resol: 19. "referring the new Constitution to Assemblies to be chosen by the people for the express purpose of ratifying it" was next taken into consideration.

Mr. ELSEWORTH moved that it be referred to the Legislatures of the States for ratification. Mr. PATTERSON 2ded. the motion. . . .

On question on Mr. Elsworth's motion to refer the plan to the Legislatures of the States

N. H. no. Mas. no. Ct. ay. no.* Pa. no. Del. ay. Md. ay. Va. no. N. C. no. S. C. no. Geo. no.

Mr. Govr. MORRIS moved that the reference of the plan be made to one general Convention, chosen & authorized by the people to consider, amend, & establish the same.—Not seconded.

On question for agreeing to Resolution 19. touching the mode of Ratification as reported from the Committee of the Whole; viz, to refer the Constn. after the approbation of Congs. to assemblies chosen by the people:

N. H. ay. Mas. ay. Ct. ay. Pa. ay. Del. no. Md. ay. Va. ay. N. C. ay. S. C. ay. Geo. ay.

[August 6, *In Convention*]

Mr. RUTLEDGE delivered in the Report of the Committee of detail as follows: a printed copy being at the same time furnished to each member:

"We the people of the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New-York, New-Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North-Carolina, South-Carolina, and Georgia, do ordain, declare, and establish the following Constitution for the Government of Ourselves and our Posterity."

[August 7, *In Convention*]

The Report of the Committee of detail being taken up, . . .

The preamble of the Report was agreed to nem. con. So were Art: I & II.

[August 30, *In Convention*]

Art: XXI. taken up. viz: The ratifications of the Conventions of States shall be sufficient for organizing this Constitution. . . .

Mr. MADISON, remarked that if the blank

* The entry in the notes was originally "N. J. no." Madison struck out "N. J." but inadvertently let "no." remain.

should be filled with "seven" "eight," or "nine"—the Constitution as it stands might be put in force over the whole body of the people, tho' less than a majority of them should ratify it.

Mr. WILSON. As the Constitution stands, the States only which ratify can be bound. We must he said in this case go to the original powers of Society. The House on fire must be extinguished, without a scrupulous regard to ordinary rights.

Mr. BUTLER was in favor of "nine." He revolted at the idea, that one or two States should restrain the rest from consulting their safety.

Mr. CARROL moved to fill the blank with "the thirteen," unanimity being necessary to dissolve the existing confederacy which had been unanimously established.

Mr. KING thought this amendt. necessary, otherwise as the Constitution now stands it will operate on the whole though ratified by a part only.

[August 31, *In Convention*]

Mr. KING moved to add to the end of art: XXI the words "between the said States" so as to confine the operation of the Govt. to the States ratifying it.

On the question

N. H. ay. Mas. ay. Ct. ay. N. J. ay. Pa. ay. Md. no. Virga. ay. N. C. ay. S. C. ay. Geo. ay. . . .

Mr. SHERMAN & Mr. DAYTON moved to fill the blank with "ten"

Mr. WILSON supported the motion of Mr. MADISON, requiring a majority both of the people and of States.

Mr. CLYMER was also in favor of it.

Col: MASON was for preserving ideas familiar to the people. Nine States had been required in all great cases under the Confederation & that number was on that account preferable

On the question for "ten"

N. H. no. Mas. no. Ct. ay. N. J. ay. Pa. no. Del. no. Md. ay. Va. no. N. C. no. S. C. no. Geo. ay.

On question for "nine"

N. H. ay. Mas. ay. Ct. ay. N. J. ay. Pa. ay. Del. ay. Md. ay. Va. no. N. C. no. S. C. no. Geo. ay.

[September 12, *In Convention*]

DOCr. JOHNSON from the Committee of stile &c. reported a digest of the plan, of which printed copies were ordered to be furnished to the members. . . .

"WE, THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, IN ORDER TO FORM a more perfect union, to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

2. *Daniel Webster's Interpretation of the Preamble to the Constitution* has been shown earlier in this Problem (p. 264) and should be reviewed at this point.

3. *Justice Story's Analysis of the Preamble* appeared in his previously quoted treatise on the Constitution.¹⁵

We have already had occasion, in considering the nature of the Constitution, to dwell upon the terms in which the preamble is conceived, and the proper conclusion deducible from it. It is an act of the people, and not of the States in their political capacities. It is an ordinance or establishment of government, and not a compact, though originating in consent; and it binds as a fundamental law promulgated by the sovereign authority and not as a compact or treaty entered into and *in fieri*, between each and all the citizens of the United States as distinct parties. The language is: "We, the *people* of the United States" (not, We, the *States*), "*do ordain and establish*" (not, *do contract* and enter into a *treaty* with each other) "*this Constitution for the United States of America*" (not *this treaty* between the several States). And it is, therefore, an unwarrantable assumption, not to call it a most extravagant stretch of interpretation, wholly at variance with the language, to substitute other words and other senses for the words and senses incorporated in this solemn manner into the substance of the instrument itself. We have the strongest assurances that this preamble was not adopted as a mere formulary, but as a solemn promulgation of a fundamental fact, vital to the character and operations of the government. The obvious object was to substitute a government of the people for a confederacy of States; a constitution for a compact.

4. *Alexander H. Stephen's Analysis* was presented in his *Constitutional View of the Late War between the States*.¹⁶

PROF. NORTON. Why, does not the Preamble to the Constitution say: "We, the people of the United States," etc., and does not this show clearly that it was submitted to the whole people, and by them acted upon, ratified and adopted, and not by the States, as States?

MR. STEPHENS. My dear sir, it shows no such thing; and it is a wonder to me how any one should ever have entertained such an idea.

PROF. NORTON. Why, does it not say: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union," etc?

MR. STEPHENS. Yes; but what is the meaning of "We the people of the United States," as they here stand? The meaning and sense of words must

always be understood from the connection in which they are found. We have abundant and conclusive evidence that they could not have been intended to mean, in the connection where they here stand, what you would have them imply. Because, the very authority of the Delegates—their credentials—which, we have seen, stated that what they should do, should be referred back to the States, should be submitted to them, and should not be binding, unless approved by them, severally and respectively. And, besides, we know that this preamble, as it unanimously passed the Convention, on the 7th of August, 1787, was in these words:—

"We, the people of the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, do ordain, declare, and establish the following Constitution," etc.

This shows what was the meaning of the Convention. It was we the people of each State. The change in the phraseology was made by a subcommittee on style, not by the Convention, except in their agreement to the Report of said committee. Why was it made? For a very obvious reason. It was not known which of the States would ratify it. Hence it was exceedingly inappropriate to set forth in advance the States by name. By the terms of the Constitution, Article VII, it was to go into operation between such of the States as might ratify it, if as many as nine or more should do so. The committee on style readily perceived that it would be exceedingly out of place, to have, in the preamble to the organic law, terms embracing a people, or States, who might not put themselves under it. For instance, Rhode Island and North Carolina did not ratify the Constitution for some time. During this period they were entirely out of the Union. They might have remained out until now. Suppose they had. How oddly would this preamble to the Constitution have read: "We the people of New Hampshire, Rhode Island, North Carolina, etc., in order to form a more perfect Union," etc., when the people of Rhode Island and North Carolina had done no such thing. . . .

Upon a close scrutiny of the change of language in the Preamble, as it was at first adopted by the Convention, and as it was reported by the committee on style, some exceedingly interesting views are suggested, but these are far from favoring the inference usually drawn from it. Let me call your special attention to them, for they have a direct and important bearing upon the point now before us. The words, as agreed to at first, in Convention, as we have seen, were:

"We, the people of the States of New Hamp-

shire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, do ordain, declare, and establish the following Constitution for the government of ourselves and our posterity."

Now look closely to the words substituted, and weigh nicely the import of the words left out, as well as those inserted. As the clause was changed by the committee on style, and afterwards unanimously adopted in the Convention, it reads as follows:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

The most striking difference in phraseology between the two, is that which sets forth the object in forming "a more perfect Union," etc., to be, to "ordain and establish this Constitution," not for the *people* in any sense, but for States as political societies. As the words originally stood, the inference *might* have been drawn from the bare words themselves, that the object was to form a government for the people in the aggregate . . . "of ourselves and our posterity" . . . but this inference is completely rebutted by the change of phraseology. As it stands, the instrument "is ordained and established" as a *Constitution for States*—for the United States. The same as if it read "for the States of this Union."

The change, in this particular, is very important, and the very Preamble, which is so often alluded to, for a directly opposite purpose, conclusively shows that the Government was intended to be, and is a Government of States, and for States, as I said. In the change of phraseology the introduction of the word *Union* has a wonderful significance of itself. The new Constitution was proposed "in order to form a *more perfect Union*," that is, it was to make more perfect "the Union" then existing. That, we have seen, was a Union of States under the Articles of Confederation. It was to revise these Articles, to enlarge the powers under them, or, in other words, to perfect that Union, that the Convention was called; and that was the object aimed at in all their labors to the conclusion of their work as set forth in this Preamble. So much for the evidence furnished by the Preamble.

But to put the matter beyond all cavil the last clause of the Constitution settles that question. That clause is in these words:

"The ratification of the Conventions of nine States shall be sufficient for the establishment of

this Constitution between the States so ratifying the same."

The word, *between*, was put in on special motion, which shows how closely words were watched, weighed, and guarded at the time. This shows, beyond all doubt or cavil, that it was to be acted upon by States as States, and not by the people of all the States in one aggregate mass. That, you will permit me, most respectfully and good-humoredly, to say, as it seems to me, is one of the most preposterous ideas that ever entered into the head of a sensible man.

5. *A Confederate View: Bledsoe.* One of the most complete and most vigorous discussions of the significance of the Preamble, again from the states'-rights standpoint, was written in 1866 by Albert T. Bledsoe, who had served as Assistant Secretary of War for the Confederacy.¹⁷

It is well known that in the original draft of the Constitution, its preamble, instead of saying, "We, the people of the United States," specified each State by name, as the previous Articles of Confederation had done. If it had remained thus, then the States would have appeared, on the very face of the preamble itself, as the parties to the Constitution. But the preamble, as is well known, was afterwards changed, by omitting to mention the States by name. There are, however, some most important facts connected with the change and the origin of the words in question, which seem to be wholly unknown on both sides of the Atlantic. They have, certainly, attracted no notice whatever from any of the writers on the great controversy between the North and the South.

The first of these facts relates to the person by whom, and the manner in which, the change in question was effected; or, the words, "We, the people of the United States," were substituted for an enumeration of the States by name. During all the great discussions of the Convention, the preamble to the Constitution retained its original form; nor was there, from the beginning to the end of their deliberations, a single whisper of dissatisfaction with it in that form. Every member of the Convention appeared perfectly satisfied that the States should stand, on the very front of the Constitution, as the parties to the compact into which they were about to enter. It was only after the provisions of the Constitution were agreed upon, and its language was referred to "a committee on style," that the names of the States were silently omitted, and the clause, "We, the people of the United States," substituted in their place.

Now, it will not be denied, that if this change had not been made by the "committee on style,"

then the States would have been parties to the new Constitution just as they had been to the old Articles of Confederation. Hence, if the interpretation of Story and Webster be the true one, then it must be admitted the "committee on style," appointed merely to express the views of the Convention, really transformed the nature of the Constitution of the United States! . . .

This clause, "We the people of the United States," introduced by the "committee on style," and passed over in perfect silence by the whole Convention, is the great stronghold, if it has one, of the Northern theory of the Constitution. The argument from these words appears in every speech, book, pamphlet, and discussion by every advocate of the North. It was wielded by Mr. Webster in his great debate with Mr. Calhoun, in 1833, and still more fully in his still more eloquent speech on Foote's resolutions in 1830. "The Constitution itself," says he, "in its very front, declares that it was ordained and established by the people of the United States in the aggregate." The fact is not so. The Constitution neither declares that it was established by the people of the United States in the aggregate, nor by the people of the United States in the segregate. But if we look into the history of the transaction, we shall find that it was established by them in the latter character, and not in the former. We shall find that each State acted separately, and for itself alone; and that no one pretended, or imagined, that the whole aggregate vote of any twelve States could bind the thirteenth State, without its own individual consent and ratification. . . .

The change in the preamble to the Constitution was effected by the pen of Governor Morris, one of the most zealous advocates in the Convention of 1787, for a strong national Government. He certainly wished all power to emanate from the people of America, and to have them regarded as one great nation. But did he accomplish his wish? In the Convention, says the record, "Gouverneur Morris moved that the reference of the plan (*i.e.*, of the Constitution) be made to one General Convention, chosen and authorized by the people, to consider, amend, and establish the same." This motion, if adopted, would indeed have caused the Constitution to be ratified by "the people of the United States in the aggregate," or as one nation. This would, in fact, have made it a Government emanating from the people of America in one General Convention assembled and not from the States. But how was this motion received by the Convention? Was it approved and passed in the affirmative by that body? It did not even find a second in the Convention of 1787. So says the record, and this is a most significant fact.

Now was the very object, which Gouverneur

Morris so signally failed to accomplish directly and openly by his motion, indirectly and covertly effected by his style? And if so, did he design to effect such a change in the fundamental law of the United States of America? . . . In supposing him capable of such a fraud on the Convention of 1787, I certainly do him no injustice, since we have his own confession that he actually perpetrated several such frauds on that assembly of Constitution-makers. "That instrument," says he in reference to the Constitution, "was written by the fingers which write this letter. Having rejected redundant terms, I believed it to be as clear as language would permit; excepting, nevertheless, a part of what relates to the judiciary. On that subject conflicting opinions had been maintained with so much professional astuteness, that it became necessary to select phrases, which expressing my own notions would not alarm others, nor shock their self-love; and to the best of my recollection this was the only part which passed without cavil." How adroitly, then, how cunningly, he cheats the Convention into the unconscious sanction of his "own notions;" and this great legislator of the North, even in the purer days of the infant republic, was proud of the fraud! . . .

But although Gouverneur Morris was capable of such a fraud on the Convention, we have no good reason to believe he intended one, by the substitution of the words, "We, the people of the United States," for the enumeration of all the States by name. He has nowhere confessed to any such thing; and besides he did not understand his own words as they are so confidently understood by Story and Webster. Every rational inquirer after truth should, it seems to me, be curious to know what sense Gouverneur Morris attached to the words in question, since it was by his pen that they were introduced into the preamble of the Constitution. . . . I answer this question in the words of Gouverneur Morris himself. "The Constitution," says he, "was a compact, not between individuals, but between political societies, the people, not of America, but of the United States, each enjoying sovereign power and of course equal rights. . . ."

Was the whole thing done then, and the nature of the Constitution transformed, by a slip of the pen, or by accident? After all their opposition both to the name and to the thing did the Convention, by sheer oversight, blunder into the construction of a purely national government, by permitting it to be established by the people of America as one grand political community? If Mr. Justice Story's view of the words, "We, the people of the United States," be correct, how did it happen that the opponents of such a mode of ratification said absolutely nothing? The whole instrument, as amended by the committee on

style, was read in the hearing of the Convention, beginning with the preamble, and yet the words, "We, the people of the United States," now deemed so formidable to the advocates of State sovereignty, did not raise a single whisper of opposition.

How could this have happened if the words in question were supposed to mean the people of America, or the whole people of the United States as one political society? Were Mason, and Martin, and Paterson, and Ellsworth, all too dull to perceive that meaning, which is so perfectly obvious to Mr. Justice Story, and which he imagines that nothing but the most purblind obstinacy can resist? . . . No. Not one of these suppositions is the true one. The whole mystery is explained in the proceedings of the Convention of 1787, as exhibited in "The Madison Papers"; an explanation which, however, has hitherto been most unaccountably overlooked. We may there find the real meaning of the words in question, and see why they gave no alarm to the advocates of State sovereignty.

If we cast our eyes all along the subject of "the mode of ratification," ranging from page 735 to page 1632 of "The Madison Papers," we shall perceive that the question, whether the Constitution should be ratified by the people of "the United States in the aggregate," or by the several States, was not considered by the Convention at all. No such question was before the Convention. . . . The error of Story and Webster is, that they construe the first clause of the Constitution as if it referred to one question; whereas, in fact, it referred to quite another and a far different question—that is, they construed this clause in profound darkness as to the origin of its words, as well as to their use and application in the Convention of 1787.

The question before the Convention was, whether the Constitution should be ratified by the legislatures or by the sovereign peoples of the several States. No one doubted that it was to be ratified by the States. This, as we shall see, was on all hands regarded as a settled point. The only question was, whether it should be ratified by the States, acting through their legislatures, or through Conventions elected to represent the people for that special purpose. In the discussion of this question, most of the members insisted that the Constitution should be ratified by the people, by the States in their sovereign capacity, or by their Conventions. These several modes of expression were, in the vocabulary of the Convention, used as convertible terms, as perfectly synonymous with each other. . . .

Some few members of the Convention were in favor of leaving "the States to choose their own mode of ratification;" but the great majority of

them insisted that the Constitution should be referred to the States for ratification, either through their legislatures or through their people in Conventions assembled. It was in regard to these two methods that the Convention was divided. All agreed that it should be done by "the States," and the only question was as to how "the States" should do it. The idea that it was designed to be done, or that it was done, by the people of America as one nation, is the dream of a later day, and, as we shall see, is nothing but a dream. . . .

In debating this question, as to the mode of ratification by the States (the only one before the Convention), some of the most inflexible advocates of State sovereignty insisted that it should be ratified by "the people of the United States." But then they understood this language, and every member of the Convention understood it to mean the peoples of the several States, as distinguished from their legislatures. If, for one moment, they had imagined that their language could have been construed to mean a ratification of the Constitution by the collective will of the whole people of America, they would have shrunk from its use with horror.

6. *The Preamble and the Theory of Secession.* The broad connection between the interpretation of the preamble and the doctrine of secession is well indicated in a concisely stated summary of the secessionist position which appeared in the Bangor (Maine) *Daily Union* of November 13, 1860.¹⁸

The government of a State is but the *agent* of the people. Its powers, limitations and instructions are all contained in a written constitution. The people are the *principal*, and they alone possess the power "to alter, reform, or totally change" that constitution. In any controversy between the sovereign people, and their agent, the government, the people alone can be the final arbiter of differences. The simple statement of these propositions is sufficient to command for them the assent of all reflecting men. If the government of our State, then, shall undertake the usurpation of powers not delegated, and that usurpation shall be sanctioned by every department of the government, including the *judiciary*, we know where to look for our own remedy. We know where the *principal*, the creating and controlling power, is. When the sovereign people speak through convention, or otherwise, the government must hear and *obey*.

The government of the United States is but an *agent*, and as such, is likewise a creation, and the subject, of some controlling power. What and where is that power? The power that created this agent must be the power to control it. To suppose

a government not answerable to any power, and the final judge of what powers it may or may not exercise under its constitution, is to suppose an irresponsible despotism.

We are not obliged to resort to speculations or theories to ascertain the origin of our National Government. We read it in history authenticated by public records and living witnesses. A convention of the thirteen original States met in Philadelphia in May, 1787, and on the 17th of September, in the same year, completed and published the present Constitution of the United States. According to the terms of the instrument itself, it was to remain a dead letter, a mere form of power without any vitality, until it should be adopted by the sovereign people of *each* of nine States, and was then to be the constitution of those States only which had adopted it. Each State was perfectly free to adopt or reject it at the will of the sovereign people of that State. On the 26th of July, 1788, it had been adopted by eleven States, and the government went into operation in April following; but it still had no force in Rhode Island and North Carolina, which had not then adopted it. Its adoption by *eleven* States gave it no force in the *two* States which had not adopted it. It could only become a vital force in those States by the sovereign act of their people acting separately and independently of each other and all others. Indeed, the government had been in full operation more than one year in the States which had adopted it before Rhode Island ratified it: still during that year the government had no more

right and made no more attempt to exercise its powers in that smallest of the States, than it did in France. . . .

The citizen of a State is bound to obey a law passed in pursuance of the Constitution of the United States, *not* because it is a law of Congress, signed by the President, and sanctioned by the judiciary, but because the sovereign people of *his* State ordained and established that Constitution, and thereby commanded him to obey such law.

We say then that the creating, controlling power of the Government of the United States is the sovereign people of *each* State. The People of *each* State are the *principal* of which the Government of the United States is the *agent*. But as one principal may have many agents, so many principals may have one agent. The Government of the United States to-day is the agent of thirty-three principals, and the State of Maine has ordained two agents, the government of Maine and the Government of the United States.—In any controversy between an agent and his principal about the extent of the powers delegated to the agent, the difference must be decided in the manner prescribed by the principal. In any controversy between the sovereignty of a State and its agent, the Government of the United States, no department of the Government can be the final arbiter, but the difference must be settled in the manner prescribed by the sovereign people of the State, *or they have their remedy in resuming their delegated powers.*

B. THE UNION IN 1860: STATIC LAW AND DYNAMIC FORCE

In the nature of the circumstances, Lincoln and the unionists were forced to meet the legal arguments of the secessionists with legal arguments against secession. When northern men leveled the charge of treason against Confederate leaders, they were making a legal accusation which could be upheld only by legal proofs. Hence the argument remained from beginning to end very largely legalistic.

In terms of pure argumentation this meant that the unionists to a very great extent permitted the Confederates to choose the ground on which the discussion would be conducted and even that they accepted the premise of the Confederates when they conceded that the nature of the union would be determined by an explicit agreement between stated parties at a definite time.

The Problems in this series have shown that in the larger sense the union was, as Kohn declares, a product of nationalist growth—of factors of affinity such as common language, common religion, common territory, common customs and traditions, common political experience. The language, the traditions, the political experience, the exchange of goods, the mingling of peoples, the accumulation of a body of common political experience—the factors, in short, which Seward emphasized, had all continued to change the character of the nation and of the union as a manifestation of nationalism, long after the “contract” of 1787 had fixed terms of union which were intended to be final.

Unionists regarded themselves in 1860 as bound by these terms and pitched their argument accordingly, but in doing so they accepted grounds which were incompatible with what they sought to defend. They defended, in fact, a dynamic union, which would change

to conform to territorial expansion, industrial growth, and technological transformation. But they sought to justify it in terms of a specific contract, the essence of which is a static relationship. A static relationship was precisely what the South sought to maintain, for its object was the perpetuation of the balanced, loosely associated relationship of 1787, despite the increasing economic disparities of sectional strength and the growing political consolidation of the nineteenth century.

The real offense of the South was not so much against the Constitution of 1787 as against the tendencies in the union of 1860—a phenomenon not foreseen in 1787. But since the latter had no legal sanction except through the former, the argument constantly turned to the narrow, legalistic, and somewhat artificial question of the implications of language which had been used eighty years before.

Although the secession controversy is meaningless as an explanation of the causes of sectionalism and nationalism, it does provide a striking illustration of the indirect and pervasive way in which these forces operated. In Problem VIII, evidence was presented to show how the slavery question became focussed politically upon the territorial issue, because that was the only form in which it could constitutionally express itself. Similarly here, a new and powerful northern section, which was rapidly moving away from the balanced system of 1787, appealed to the instrument of 1787 for sanctions to compel the South to accept the new trends. At the same time the South, which had subordinated state-consciousness to an acute sectional pride, invoked the rights of states to do piecemeal what it had no means of doing as a section.

Secession, proclaiming the primacy of the states, received its trial, not because anyone wished to establish the primacy of the states but because it provided a technique for fulfilling sectional aspirations. How much these aspirations, like national aspirations, operated in terms of community of economic interests, community of traditions, and community of cultural values and how little in the constitutional terms which they so freely employed is indicated clearly in an editorial in *De Bow's Review* published in New Orleans in 1851.¹⁹

There are two things upon which the whole South seems now agreed, *as one man*, whatever minor points may separate us;—and these are, *that grievous wrongs have been done, as well as gratuitous insults offered us, by the free States of the North, and the Congress of the Union, and that the cup of forbearance or endurance is so full that a single drop shall make it overflow.* . . .

The cup of endurance is full! Are we in earnest, men of the South, in this declaration, and do we realize in all its force how much is involved in it? *Is this the Southern platform?* Thank God if we had such a platform to stand upon and unite together upon, we could then be respectable, could be feared, could present an unbroken phalanx to the invader, and bid him move, and die. . . .

It is in the power of the South to save the Union, but it will require her *united and concerted* action to do it. We therefore favor,—

1. *A Southern Convention*—a Convention of the whole of the slave States, in which, disregarding all points of difference, it shall be laid down in distinct and unmistakable terms, what will constitute, in the judgment of *all* of them, a ground for *resistance*, or for the establishment, should necessity demand even that extreme, of a separate Confederation. This fixed—and there would assuredly be little difficulty in doing it—it would be the duty, perhaps, of those States who are already insisting upon action, to yield their own preferences, for the general good of the South.

Common interests and common dangers should unite us, and upon this platform we would be irresistible. We believe that the South can be united now, and that a Convention of our States will resolve unanimously, and with enthusiasm, that with a single move more upon the part of the North, the "Rubicon" will be passed forever. This combined action seems to us the only one likely to be effective, however high our admiration and regard for those gallant States who are now disposed, solitary and alone, to strike for their rights, and leap, Curtius-like, into the yawning chasm.

We are in favor of a Convention, not exactly like that of Nashville, which represented but a few States, but one of *all the South*, elected by the people, and charged to demand, like the Barons of Runningmead, the *great charter* of their liberties, or, like the Parliament of England, their *bill of inalienable rights*.

Perhaps this Convention may save the Union, and *perpetuate* it. We think it will. At all events, such a Convention could not endanger the Union, unless its further preservation would be a crime.

2. We are in favor of a *Southern Mercantile Convention*, as a present proper means of strengthening the South and enabling her to retain at home the millions of wealth now contributed to the North, by building our own ships and conducting our own trade with foreign powers, and realizing all of the immense benefits to be derived therefrom. There has never been any good reason

ior our subserviency in this particular, and there cannot be now, when our favors are received with systematic abuse. We are glad to hail already a movement in this behalf in some of the Southern States.

3. We propose, too, a *Southern Manufacturing Convention*, and that we agree to manufacture at home every bale of cotton that we eventually consume, and pay no more tribute to Northern looms. It is in the power of the South, if she pleases, to hush the sound of every spindle in New-England; and if she has the power, should she be so merciful as not to use it? Much cause has she, indeed, for forbearance!

4. We are for diversifying in every way our industry, and sending out of our limits for nothing that we can make within them. Has the North iron, and coal, and granite, marble and other minerals? So have we, in bountiful profusion, needing but the willing hand to develope them. Let us build railroads and plank roads, and invest

in them our surplus capital, and foster such improvements in spite of every discouragement.

5. Let our people cease their annual migrations to the North, in which they squander millions, which, if retained at home, would give new life to every branch of domestic employment with us. We have watering places that need but *fashion* to make them equal, if not superior, to Saratoga or Cape May, with none of their disadvantages. Our children should be educated at home; yet at this moment there are thousands of Southern youth rejoicing at Cambridge, or Yale, or Amherst, and similar institutions, whilst our own Colleges and Universities have but a stagnant life. We should encourage our own literature, as well as educate our children. A Southern periodical or a Southern book is a *rara avis*, whilst every shelf or table at the South groans under the product of Northern brains. Good this product *may be*—but is there nothing good, fellow citizens, except beyond the limits of Nazareth?

X

The Outbreak of the Civil War

WE will secede! We lay this down as a fixed proposition, for we cannot believe in the accusation of our State's disgrace, in other words, that she will submit, until it becomes history. . . . The first assault will be made upon us by the Federal Government by the act of retaining the Forts about Charleston. *This will be war.* We entered the Confederacy [*i.e.* the Union] by delegating certain powers to the Federal Government as our *agent*—for certain purposes. With those *powers* we delegated or gave the Government certain portions of land in the neighborhood of Charleston for the purpose of the defence of our port. The *powers*, because *abused* we *resume*. We take the defence of our ports in our own hands, and therefore the cause for the possession of those places by the Government having ceased, . . . by matter of right they revert to us. . . . Should the General Government then retain possession of them— It would be war, . . . not our seeking, but that of the Government.

CAMDEN (S.C.) *Southern Republic*, JULY 5, 1851

CONTENTS

Questions for Study	276
Historical Background	277
Part I: Lincoln's Answer to Secession	279
Part II: The Outbreak of Hostilities	286

QUESTIONS FOR STUDY

1. In Part I, Section A, four aspects of federal authority are mentioned, any one of which Lincoln might have used to force the issue with the Confederacy. What does he say about each of these in his Inaugural, and what does this imply as to his intention to force the issue?
2. Some advocates of a very strong union policy described Lincoln's Inaugural as the "iron hand in a velvet glove." Did the facts justify this phrase?
3. Part I, Section A 2, shows what Lincoln first intended to say about the forts as compared with what he actually said. What is the significance of the change?
4. Part I, Section A 3, throws further light on one of the four aspects of federal authority mentioned in question 1. In terms of relations with the Confederacy, what was the idea behind Lincoln's letters of March 18 to his three cabinet members?
5. Summarize the reasons given by various editorial writers for regarding the Inaugural as a war message.
6. Of the editorials quoted, which seems to you to show most insight into Lincoln's policy? Explain.
7. What new factor introduced into the situation immediately after the Inaugural made it necessary for Lincoln to modify his plan of procedure? What was the contingency upon which Lincoln declared that he would have evacuated Fort Sumter? Why wasn't this contingency used?
8. Is there enough evidence to justify the positive, unqualified statement that Lincoln at one time made a conditional offer to evacuate Fort Sumter?
9. Rearrange the following in correct chronological sequence, and, as nearly as possible, show the date of each:
 - (1) Lincoln's decision to have a naval force ready to go to the relief of Sumter.
 - (2) Lincoln's final decision to send the Sumter expedition.
 - (3) The final order to reinforce Pickens.
 - (4) The second Presidential order to reinforce Pickens.
 - (5) The arrival in Washington of the news that Fort Pickens had not been reinforced as planned.
 - (6) The order of the War Department to reinforce Fort Pickens.
 - (7) Lincoln's decision that he could not trust professional military advisers but must decide questions concerning the forts himself.
 - (8) The dispatch of Lincoln's notice to the governor of South Carolina.
 - (9) Lincoln's original order to reinforce Fort Pickens.
10. Why did Lincoln lose faith in the military advice of General Scott?
11. Why were the first orders of the War Department to reinforce Pickens not carried out, although delivered to the officer who should have executed them?
12. Lincoln said that he decided to send the Sumter expedition after learning that Pickens had not been reinforced. Does the evidence confirm this statement?
13. Did Seward pledge the administration to evacuate Sumter? Was he authorized to go as far as he did? Why did he go as far as he did?
14. Summarize (1) the reasons and (2) the evidence for believing that Lincoln maneuvered to cause the Confederates to attack Sumter.
15. Summarize (1) the reasons and (2) the evidence for believing that Lincoln sought to avoid a clash of arms at Sumter.
16. By an historical irony Lincoln succeeded in sending troops into one fort without precipitating war, but war was precipitated at another fort where he had promised not to send in troops. Explain.

By 1860, as preceding Problems have shown, sectional tensions were subjecting the union to terrific strain and had become almost unbearable. The rejuvenation of slavery, as the "Cotton Kingdom" rose, and the fierceness of the Abolitionist assault had begun to sharpen sectional lines. Thereafter, the constant struggle over the territories had enabled political agitation to inflame the emotions of both sections. Finally, in the 1850s, a series of dramatic and even violent episodes—the repeal of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, the Dred Scott Decision, the publication of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, the sporadic fighting in "Bleeding Kansas," the assault on Charles Sumner, and the attempt by John Brown to start an insurrection at Harper's Ferry had tended further to divide the body of American citizens into extreme and hostile camps. Meanwhile the South grew to believe in a Constitutional right of secession, and this belief undermined the structural foundations of the union.

But despite all these divisive factors, the union did not go to pieces until the Presidential election of 1860. As candidate of the Republican party in this election, Lincoln ran against a divided opposition on a platform which called for the exclusion of slavery from the territories. His candidacy caused intense excitement in the South, where common report treated him as a thoroughgoing Abolitionist although he had repeatedly stated his recognition of the right to maintain slavery in the states.

When the votes were counted in November 1860, it was apparent that Lincoln had been elected. To the lower South this meant that a hostile force was about to seize control of the government, and it was the signal for secession from the union. The crisis now at hand developed rapidly during the following winter in the long four-month interval between Lincoln's election and his inauguration. During this period, while James Buchanan still remained in the White House, the secession movement gained momentum. South Carolina adopted an Ordinance of Secession in December, and Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas followed her lead in January and February. In the latter month these newly seceded states formed themselves into a Southern union, the Confederate States of America. The entire lower South regarded itself as being out of the old union, but it should be emphasized that the secession movement failed to sweep the slave states as a whole, for eight of them—Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, and Arkansas—refusing to secede, held fast to the Union. In most of these states, however, the prevailing opinion was that any state had a right to secede if it wished to; thus while Virginia, for instance, did not wish to, she did not believe in restraining any state that chose to withdraw from the union.

In March, when Lincoln finally came to the Presidency, the union faced the worst crisis in its history. A number of states regarded themselves as separate from the union, exempt from federal jurisdiction, beyond the sphere of federal law. The President regarded them as members of the union, within the federal jurisdiction, and subject to federal law. To make the crisis even more acute, these states had seized federal property including most of the forts and arsenals in the southern states. Two of these forts, which lay offshore, had not been seized—Fort Sumter in Charleston harbor and Fort Pickens in Pensacola harbor. But both these positions were in a state of siege, for men and supplies were not permitted to pass in or out except by the consent of Confederate officials. Artillery fire had already driven back one vessel which sought to bring supplies to Fort Sumter. These two forts presented a critical problem to both federal and Confederate governments, for to the Confederacy the presence of federal troops seemed a threat of coercion; to the union,

Confederate military efforts to compel withdrawal from the forts seemed treason against the American flag.

This was the situation when Lincoln took office. Six weeks later, fighting had begun with a Confederate bombardment of Fort Sumter, and Lincoln had at once called for 75,000 troops. A war had broken out which was, as Lincoln himself afterward observed, longer and more costly than anyone had foreseen. In the ultimate sense, of course, deep sectional forces had caused this conflict, but, in the immediate sense, why did it begin at Charleston? Why did it start on April 12? Since secession had operated for almost four months without causing war, why did not the impasse continue for eight or twelve months without hostilities? Most directly of all, what was Lincoln's responsibility in this matter? Did he plan it this way in a righteous program to compel obedience to the union? Did he merely stand passive in bewildered inaction for six weeks until the Confederates solved his problem for him? Or did he resolutely try for peace, only to have war thrust upon him by Confederates who desired a military showdown as a means of solidifying the divided South?

And what of the forts? If Lincoln had planned for peace, why did he not handle the question of the forts in such a way as to forestall war? Did his administration ever promise to evacuate Fort Sumter, and if so, why was not that promise kept? Why did he send a naval expedition to the relief of Sumter at the very time when the situation seemed most delicate?

These questions and others like them are all part of the larger problem of the linkage between broad forces and specific events. Sectionalism had created antagonisms that potentially threatened war. But potentialities do not determine events. They only determine the limits within which events occur. War crises have often existed without causing wars. Accordingly, the events which produced the war of April 1861 from the war crisis of March deserve analysis along with the underlying forces.

Part I.

LINCOLN'S ANSWER TO SECESSION

When Lincoln arrived in Washington in the last week of February 1861, he faced a more difficult situation than any President before him. He made this observation himself, and it was the one point on which no one disagreed with him. His difficulties were in no way alleviated by the wide range of the advice thrust upon him and the variety of courses that he was urged to follow. One group, consisting especially of Abolitionists, viewed a separation from the slave states with self-righteous complaisance and wanted him to let the southern states leave unmolested. Others, with a taste for strong-arm tactics, proposed to march the conquering legions of the union in triumph to the Gulf of Mexico. Still others, especially from the border states, desired to invoke again the principle of compromise which had been used to save both peace and union so often before. Senator John J. Crittenden of Kentucky, as the principal spokesman of this group, had offered during the winter a Constitutional amendment which would revive the old Missouri Compromise line of 36° 30' as a means of dividing not only the existing territories but all future territories as well. But Lincoln had made known to party leaders his opposition to this proposal, and Congress had rejected it without actually knowing whether it would have induced the seceding states to return to the union.

The great majority of ordinary citizens probably wanted most of all to save the union, without, however, having any clear or positive ideas as to how their objective could be gained.

Amid this welter of uncertainty and conflicting proposals, the country at large anxiously awaited a clear announcement of policy in Lincoln's inaugural address. Only a handful of people possessed advance information of his intentions. The public, meanwhile, wondered whether he would turn at the last moment to compromise as the only escape from the alternatives of disunion or war. Would he accept one of these alternatives? Or did he have some unforeseen design to save the union without resorting to either compromise or war?

Lincoln, as expected, gave his answer on March 4. His First Inaugural Address is still the best available statement of what his policy was, but, like others of his most famous statements such as the House Divided Speech, the Inaugural has been interpreted in a wide variety of ways. Some of these interpretations will be given in the selections below. As a preliminary, however, one may note that the basic question was whether Lincoln wished to force the issue and compel the Davis government either to accept federal authority or to resist it physically.

In an evaluation of Lincoln's own statement of policy, as well as the statements of others who were trying to read various meanings into Lincoln's words, it is worth examining the precise ways in which a collision might have come about or been avoided. These ways were far less numerous then than they would be today, for the specific local exercise of federal authority at that time was much more limited. Today, for instance, failure to pay the income tax might have been used to penalize secessionists, as it has later been used to penalize gangsters. But there was no income tax at that time, and indeed there were only about four functions in which federal authority might be asserted and secession thereby challenged at the local level. These four were (1) the delivery of the United States mails, (2) the appointment of federal marshals and federal judges who would enforce the federal laws (most of the officials of this class in the southern states had resigned and federal laws and courts were in abeyance), (3) the collection of federal tariff or customs duties at the ports of entry in the southern states, and (4) the administration of federal property such as the forts and arsenals. If Lincoln wished to make an issue he would find his strongest legal position by making it in connection with one of these points.

A.

LINCOLN'S STATEMENT OF HIS POLICY

Lincoln's own statement of the policy of his administration is to be found in his Inaugural Address and in a comparison between the final address and earlier drafts. Certain instructions and inquiries to members of his cabinet also shed light on what he was attempting to do.

1. *The Inaugural Address, March 4, 1861.* Lincoln began by reaffirming his recognition of slavery in the states ("I have no purpose directly or indirectly to interfere with . . . slavery in the states where it exists" etc. See p. 242), and then turned to the question of his policy toward the states declaring themselves out of the union.¹

It is seventy-two years since the first inauguration of a President under our national Constitution. During that period fifteen different and greatly distinguished citizens, have, in succession, administered the executive branch of the government. They have conducted it through many perils; and, generally, with great success. Yet, with all this scope for [of] precedent, I now enter upon the same task for the brief constitutional term of four years, under great and peculiar difficulty. A disruption of the Federal Union, heretofore only menaced, is now formidably attempted.

I hold, that in contemplation of universal law, and of the Constitution, the Union of these States is perpetual. Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all national governments. It is safe to assert that no government proper, ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. Continue to execute all the express provisions of our national Constitution, and the Union will endure forever—it being impossible to destroy it, except by some action not provided for in the instrument itself.

Again, if the United States be not a government proper, but an association of States in the nature of contract merely, can it, as a contract, be peaceably unmade, by less than all the parties who made it? One party to a contract may violate it—break it, so to speak; but does it not require all to lawfully rescind it? . . .

It follows from these views that no State, upon its own mere motion, can lawfully get out of the Union,—that *resolves* and *ordinances* to that effect are legally void, and that acts of violence, within any State or States, against the authority of the United States, are insurrectionary or revolutionary, according to circumstances.

I therefore consider that in view of the Constitution and the laws, the Union is unbroken; and to the extent of my ability I shall take care, as the Constitution itself expressly enjoins upon me, that

the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the States. Doing this I deem to be only a simple duty on my part; and I shall perform it, so far as practicable, unless my rightful masters, the American people, shall withhold the requisite means, or, in some authoritative manner, direct the contrary. I trust this will not be regarded as a menace, but only as the declared purpose of the Union that it will constitutionally defend and maintain itself.

In doing this there needs to be no bloodshed or violence; and there shall be none, unless it be forced upon the national authority. The power confided to me will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the property and places belonging to the government, and to collect the duties and imposts; but beyond what may be necessary for these objects, there will be no invasion—no using of force against or among the people anywhere. Where hostility to the United States, in any interior locality, shall be so great and so universal as to prevent competent resident citizens from holding the Federal offices, there will be no attempt to force obnoxious strangers among the people for that object. While the strict legal right may exist in the government to enforce the exercise of these offices, the attempt to do so would be so irritating, and so nearly impracticable with all, that I deem it better to forego, for the time, the uses of such offices.

The mails, unless repelled, will continue to be furnished in all parts of the Union. So far as possible, the people everywhere shall have that sense of perfect security which is most favorable to calm thought and reflection. The course here indicated will be followed, unless current events and experience shall show a modification or change to be proper; and in every case and exigency my best discretion will be exercised according to circumstances actually existing, and with a view and a hope of a peaceful solution of the national troubles, and the restoration of fraternal sympathies and affections.

That there are persons in one section or another who seek to destroy the Union at all events, and are glad of any pretext to do it, I will neither affirm or deny it; but if there be such, I need address no word to them. To those, however, who really love the Union, may I not speak?

Before entering upon so grave a matter as the

destruction of our national fabric, with all its benefits, its memories and its hopes, would it not be wise to ascertain precisely why we do it? Will you hazard so desperate a step, while there is any possibility that any portion of the ills you fly from have no real existence? Will you, while the certain ills you fly to, are greater than all the real ones you fly from? Will you risk the commission of so fearful a mistake?

All profess to be content in the Union, if all constitutional rights can be maintained. Is it true, then, that any right, plainly written in the Constitution, has been denied? I think not. Happily the human mind is so constituted, that no party can reach to the audacity of doing this. Think, if you can, of a single instance in which a plainly written provision of the Constitution has ever been denied. If, by the mere force of numbers, a majority should deprive a minority of any clearly written constitutional right, it might, in a moral point of view, justify revolution—certainly would, if such a right were a vital one. But such is not our case. All the vital rights of minorities, and of individuals, are so plainly assured to them, by affirmations and negations, guarantees and prohibitions, in the Constitution, that controversies never arise concerning them. But no organic law can ever be framed with a provision specifically applicable to every question which may occur in practical administration. No foresight can anticipate, nor any document of reasonable length contain express provisions for all possible questions. Shall fugitives from labor be surrendered by national or by State authority? The Constitution does not expressly say. *May* Congress prohibit slavery in the territories? The Constitution does not expressly say. *Must* Congress protect slavery in the territories? The Constitution does not expressly say.

From questions of this class spring all our constitutional controversies, and we divide upon them into majorities and minorities. If the minority will not acquiesce, the majority must, or the government must cease. There is no other alternative; for continuing the government is acquiescence on one side or the other.

If a minority, in such case, will secede rather than acquiesce, they make a precedent which, in turn, will divide and ruin them; for a minority of their own will secede from them whenever a majority refuses to be controlled by such minority. For instance, why may not any portion of a new confederacy, a year or two hence, arbitrarily secede again, precisely as portions of the present Union now claim to secede from it? All who cherish disunion sentiments, are now being educated to the exact temper of doing this.

Is there such perfect identity of interests among the States to compose a new Union, as to produce

harmony only, and prevent renewed secession?

Plainly, the central idea of secession, is the essence of anarchy. A majority, held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations, and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments is the only true sovereign of a free people. Whoever rejects it, does, of necessity, fly to anarchy or to despotism. Unanimity is impossible; the rule of a minority, as a permanent arrangement, is wholly inadmissible; so that, rejecting the majority principle, anarchy or despotism in some form is all that is left. . . .

One section of our country believes slavery is *right*, and ought to be extended, while the other believes it is *wrong*, and ought not to be extended. This is the only substantial dispute. The fugitive slave clause of the Constitution, and the law for the suppression of the foreign slave trade, are each as well enforced, perhaps, as any law can ever be in a community where the moral sense of the people imperfectly supports the law itself. The great body of the people abide by the dry legal obligation in both cases, and a few break over in each. This, I think, cannot be perfectly cured; and it would be worse in both cases *after* the separation of the sections, than before. The foreign slave trade, now imperfectly suppressed, would be ultimately revived without restriction, in one section; while fugitive slaves, now only partially surrendered, would not be surrendered at all, by the other.

Physically speaking, we cannot separate. We cannot remove our respective sections from each other, nor build an impassable wall between them. A husband and wife may be divorced, and go out of the presence, and beyond the reach of each other; but the different parts of our country cannot do this. They cannot but remain face to face; and intercourse, either amicable or hostile, must continue between them. Is it possible, then, to make that intercourse more advantageous or more satisfactory, *after* separation than *before*? Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws? Can treaties be more faithfully enforced between aliens than laws can among friends? Suppose you go to war, you cannot fight always; and when, after much loss on both sides, and no gain on either, you cease fighting, the identical old questions, as to terms of intercourse, are again upon you.

This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their *constitutional* right of amending it, or their *revolutionary* right to dismember or overthrow it. I cannot be ignorant of the fact that many worthy and patriotic citizens are desirous of having the national Constitution amended. While I make no recommendation of amend-

ments, I fully recognize the rightful authority of the people over the whole subject to be exercised in either of the modes prescribed in the instrument itself; and I should under existing circumstances favor rather than oppose a fair opportunity being afforded the people to act upon it.

I will venture to add that to me the Convention mode seems preferable, in that it allows amendments to originate with the people themselves, instead of only permitting them to take or reject propositions, originated by others, not especially chosen for the purpose, and which might not be precisely such as they would wish to either accept or refuse. I understand a proposed amendment to the Constitution, which amendment, however, I have not seen, has passed Congress, to the effect that the Federal Government shall never interfere with the domestic institutions of the States, including that of persons held to service. To avoid misconstruction of what I have said, I depart from my purpose not to speak of particular amendments, so far as to say that holding such a provision to now be implied constitutional law, I have no objection to its being made express and irrevocable.

The Chief Magistrate derives all his authority from the people, and they have conferred none upon him to fix terms for the separation of the States. The people themselves can do this also if they choose; but the executive, as such, has nothing to do with it. His duty is to administer the present government, as it came to his hands, and to transmit it, unimpaired by him, to his successor.

Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or equal hope, in the world? In our present differences, is either party without faith of being in the right? If the Almighty Ruler of nations, with his eternal truth and justice, be on your side of the North or on yours of the South, that truth, and that justice, will surely prevail, by the judgment of this great tribunal, of the American people.

By the frame of the government under which we live, this same people have wisely given their public servants but little power for mischief; and have, with equal wisdom, provided for the return of that little to their own hands at very short intervals. While the people retain their virtue and vigilance, no administration, by any extreme of wickedness or folly, can very seriously injure the government in the short space of four years.

My countrymen, one and all, think calmly and well upon this whole subject. Nothing valuable can be lost by taking time. If there be an object to *hurry* any of you, in hot haste, to a step which you would never take *deliberately*, that object will be frustrated by taking time; but no good object can be frustrated by it. Such of you as are now

dissatisfied, still have the old Constitution unimpaired, and, on the sensitive point, the laws of your own framing under it; while the new administration will have no immediate power, if it would, to change either. If it were admitted that you who are dissatisfied, hold the right side in the dispute, there still is no single good reason for precipitate action. Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him, who has never yet forsaken this favored land, are still competent to adjust, in the best way, all our present difficulty.

In your *hands*, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen, and not in *mine*, is the momentous issue of civil war. The government will not assail *you*. You can have no conflict, without being yourselves the aggressors. *You* have no oath registered in Heaven to destroy the government, while *I* shall have the most solemn one to "preserve, protect and defend" it.

I am loth to close. We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battle-field and patriot grave, to every living heart and hearth-stone, all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.

2. *The Question of the Forts.* It is important to know that what Lincoln finally said about the forts (sixth paragraph of preceding selection) was not what he first intended to say. The original draft of the Inaugural contained the following passage, which was dropped on final revision.²

All the power at my disposal will be used to reclaim the public property and places which have fallen; to hold, occupy, and possess these and all other property and places belonging to the Government, and to collect the duties and imposts; but beyond what may be necessary for these objects, there will be no invasion of any State. Where hostility to the United States, in any interior locality, shall be so great and so universal as to prevent competent resident citizens from holding the Federal offices, there will be no attempt to force obnoxious strangers among the people for that object.

3. *Lincoln on Collection of Customs.* On March 18 Lincoln addressed three letters to three members of his cabinet, all dealing with the possibility of collecting customs duties offshore. One of these letters, to Secretary of the Navy Welles, inquired "what amount of naval force you could at once place at the control of the revenue service." The second, to Attorney General Bates, asked for an opin-

ion in writing whether under the Constitution and existing laws the executive had power to collect duties on shipboard offshore in cases where their collection in the ordinary way was by any cause rendered impracticable. The third, to Secretary of the Treasury Chase, read as follows.³

Sir: I shall be obliged if you will inform me whether any goods, wares, and merchandise subject by law to the payment of duties, are now being imported into the United States without such

duties being paid or secured according to law. And if yea, at what place or places, and for what cause, do such duties remain unpaid or unsecured?

I will also thank you for your opinion whether, as a matter of fact, vessels off shore could be effectively used to prevent such importations, or to enforce the payment or securing of the duties. If yea, what number and description of vessels in addition to those already in the revenue service would be requisite?

Your obedient servant,
A. LINCOLN

B. CONTEMPORARY INTERPRETATIONS OF LINCOLN'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Historical controversy may question whether the meaning of Lincoln's Inaugural was clear and straightforward or whether it was ambiguous and loaded with hidden meaning. Contemporary commentators found in the address an amazing variety of meanings. These are sampled in the four newspaper editorials printed below. Which seem to provide a true elucidation of the Inaugural? Which show primarily a determination to find in it what the writer had wished or expected to find?

1. "*The Inaugural*," Editorial in *Richmond (Va.) Dispatch*, March 5, 1861.⁴

The Inaugural Address of ABRAHAM LINCOLN inaugurates civil war, as we have predicted it would from the beginning. The Black Republicans have played their deep, temporizing game with profound address and subtlety; but there is no longer any need of concealment, and the veil drops from the false prophet. The Demon of Coercion stands unmasked. The sword is drawn and the scabbard thrown away. If the fifteen Slave States had gone out in a body, this would have never been. But, as it is, the Border States lie almost at the mercy of an invader. Their forts are filled with Federal troops, whilst they have not raised a finger for defence. No doubt Fortress Monroe, in a month, will be powerfully reinforced, and ere long Virginia may be engaged in a life and death struggle for independence, honor, and for all that makes existence worth living.

We have no intention of arguing the points raised by his Sable Excellency upon the right of secession. That is a subject upon which there is the most radical disagreement between the North and South, a disagreement which he proposes to reconcile by the sword. This pregnant paragraph is all that concerns us.

[Here the editorial quotes the paragraph of the inaugural which declares, "I shall take care . . . that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the States. . . . The power confided to me will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the

property and places belonging to the Government, and to collect the duties on imports."]

There is but one power under Heaven that can keep this man from executing his purpose, THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, which he recognizes as his Master, and in order to secure the interposition of that power, every Border State ought to go out of the Union within twenty-four hours. Even this movement, which would once have been effectual, may now be too late to avert the catastrophe, but it will at all events mitigate its force. It will increase the difficulties of the ferocious enterprise which these enemies of humanity propose; it is the only alternative, except the most abject humiliation.

2. "*Mr. Lincoln's Inaugural*," Editorial in *Raleigh North Carolina Standard*, March 9, 1861.⁵

Our opinions in relation to the Chicago platform, Abraham Lincoln, and the Black Republican party are well known. We are as hostile to Mr. Lincoln and to the sectional party that elected him as any reasonable man in the South. We will never submit to the administration of the government on the principles of that party so far as they relate to slavery in the Territories; but while we say this for the hundredth time, we also hold that justice should be done even to Mr. Lincoln and his party, and that he who would deliberately fan the flame of sectional strife, instead of doing all he can to put out the fires of discord which threaten to consume the temple of the Union, is guilty of

an inexpiable crime. We want peace, not war. We want Union, not disunion. We want justice for the South, but we must do justice to the North. We long for light, not darkness. We believe that the Union can be preserved, and we are willing to bear and forbear—to watch and wait—to labor in a fraternal spirit to achieve this most desirable result. When the enemy offers us the olive branch we will not reject it. When he approaches us pointing to his oath, yet in a spirit of amity, we will not rush upon him with the sword. When he pleads for the Union we will point to the Constitution; and if both of us should then pause, we would then go with him to the fountain of all power, the people of the States, and seek there, and establish there, if possible, new foundations for equality and brotherhood.

So far as coercion is concerned, Mr. Lincoln occupies the very ground occupied by Mr. Buchanan.—We have compared the Inaugural in this respect with Mr. Buchanan's message, and the fact is so.—We cannot, as an honest man, denounce in Mr. Lincoln what we approved in Mr. Buchanan. The man had just taken an oath to support the Constitution and to enforce the laws. What was he to do? Was he to say to the seven cotton States, you are out of the Union? Who gave him that authority? Has Congress said it? No. Have the American people said it. No. The mails are still furnished to these States, and Mr. Lincoln says he will continue to furnish them unless they are repelled. But he says he must execute the laws, and in the next breath he virtually omits the cotton States as Mr. Buchanan omitted South Carolina, for the simple reason that he has no officers in those States and cannot execute them. He says that in "interior localities" where competent resident citizens will not or cannot hold the offices, "there will be no attempt to force obnoxious strangers" on the people. But he says he will collect the revenue in the cotton States. How? He must do it, if at all, at the Custom Houses, for he has no authority to do so on shipboard. The law provides only for the collection of the revenue at the Custom Houses. Congress has made no other provision. What then? Why he can do nothing in this respect. Mr. Buchanan could do nothing in this respect in South-Carolina, yet he said, as Mr. Lincoln says, that the laws must be enforced.

If Mr. Lincoln were mad enough to attempt to subjugate the Southern States, or even if he were disposed to do so—as his Inaugural shows he is not—he has no army at his command. He might spare a thousand troops from the forts and frontiers, but what could these do against the armies of the fifteen slaveholding States? Then he has no money. The Treasury is empty. Then he has no authority for raising troops, even if he

had money to pay them with. The "force bill" so-called, was defeated in the House of Representatives. What then? He is powerless. He is not only powerless at present, but the tone of his Inaugural shows that he is alarmed in view of the calamities that impend. Will he be stronger in future? We do not believe he will.—His party is already demoralized, and in addition to this, the great body of the Northern people will never consent to an aggressive war on the South.—If the seven cotton States had remained in the Union, both branches of Congress would have been against Mr. Lincoln by large majorities, and the Senate could have dictated all his important appointments. But they abandoned the Union—abandoned it selfishly and for no sufficient cause, and left us at the mercy, *as they say*, of a dominant sectional party. Shall we go out simply because they did? We trust not. Have we of the middle States no self-respect—no will of our own? We think we have *some* will of our own, for we are still in the Union.

Mr. Lincoln will have no more power to enforce the laws in the "Confederate States" than the late President had; and we all know that Mr. Buchanan enforced no law in South-Carolina after that State assumed to secede, and the only coercion he attempted was in the shape of letters and newspapers which he showered from his *mail batteries* all over the State.

Mr. Lincoln is inclined to favor a Convention of all the States. We think the condition of the country and the progress of events will compel him to assemble Congress at an early day. If he should do that, a Convention of all the States could be called, and such a body, we make no doubt, would be able to reconstruct the Union on an enduring basis. Failing to do that, however, it could at least provide for a peaceable separation of the States.

We do not propose to comment further on this document. It is before our readers, and each one of them will read and study it carefully for himself.—We approve portions of it, and we disapprove other portions. *It is not a war message.* It is not, strictly speaking, a Black Republican message; for while he recognizes slavery in the States as perpetual, and as never to be interfered with in any way by the abolitionists, he deliberately refrains from pressing the main principle in his platform, to wit, the exclusion of the South from all the Territories of the Union. It is not unfriendly to the South. It deprecates war, and bloodshed, and it pleads for the Union. That any portion of it will be approved by the Disunionists we have no idea. If it had breathed violence and war—if it had claimed the government for the North exclusively, and had threatened the South with subjugation, the Disunionists would have

shouted for joy, as they did in Charleston when they learned that Lincoln was elected, for they would then have been sure of the attainment of their darling purpose, the permanent and final disruption of the Union.

3. "*What Does He Mean?*", *Editorial in the Providence (R.I.) Daily Post, March 8, 1861*. The proposition of the peace congress, to which this editorial alludes, was a plan voted in a convention of delegates from twenty-two states meeting in Washington in February at the request of Virginia. Like the Crittenden Compromise, it proposed a revival of the 36° 30' line, though it sought to apply the formula to existing territories and not to all future acquisitions as Crittenden would have done. The South would have been less likely to accept the peace congress plan than the Crittenden plan. The *Daily Post* is correct in saying that Lincoln used his influence against territorial compromise.⁶

The President has given to the country an Inaugural Address, and the country is trying to understand it. Every sentence is being discussed in the newspapers, and in almost all public and private circles. The fact that almost everybody turns from the consideration of his language with some degree of uncertainty and dissatisfaction, shows that if the President selected his words with the view of making clear his views, he was, partially at least, unsuccessful. There is some plain talk in the address; but the fact that it is immediately followed by obscurely stated qualifications, renders the study of even the plainest sentences rather tiresome. Evidently enough it is impossible to interpret the address without some consideration of the author's antecedents, speeches, political creed, and party connections. The deeper we search into these, unfortunately, the stronger becomes the conviction that the President *does not* mean peace, or even all that he says in favor of it.

Mr. Douglas examines the President in the light of a new comer upon the public stage, and inclines to the belief that he means peace. He says, "On the question of the preservation of the Union by peaceful means, and the settlement of the slavery question by amendments to the Constitution, if I understand the President's true meaning, I am with him." Other gentlemen, occupying high positions, and sincerely anxious, as Mr. Douglas is, for the preservation of the Union, might say, very truthfully, that if they understand Mr. Lincoln's true meaning, they *are not* with him. It is this *true meaning* which is in doubt; and this doubt accounts for any seeming difference of position with reference to Lincoln, between Union men.

Now, it seems [to] us that something may be

gained, in this search for the true meaning of Mr. Lincoln's language, even after we have applied all the tests within our reach to what he actually says, by taking cognizance of two facts. The first is, that Mr. Lincoln has certainly spurned and turned his back upon every measure which has been proposed in Congress with any promise of securing peace to the country. The Crittenden proposition was voted down by his friends. The proposition of the Peace Congress was voted down by his friends. And several other measures, intended to restore peace, were voted down by his friends—*after they had had an opportunity of ascertaining his views and wishes in regard to them*. That he killed these measures, there cannot be to-day, in any intelligent mind, the shadow of a doubt. He did consent to a declaration in the Constitution, to the effect that Congress shall not interfere with slavery *in the States*. Just such a declaration is found in the platform of his party; and very little, if anything, is gained at this moment, by its adoption in Congress. But we defy any friend of Mr. Lincoln to say that he has made, or sanctioned, or recommended, any measure of conciliation or concession. With a full knowledge that this was *precisely what was wanted*, he has done no such thing.

The other fact to be considered is, that Mr. Lincoln not only denies the right of secession, but ignores the thing itself. He regards the Union as unbroken. Secession, he says, is either insurrection or revolution. So we have contended. But *secession is a fact*, nevertheless; and because a State may not legally secede, it is folly to say that seven States have not seceded. *Yet Mr. Lincoln does say this*; and he gives us to understand—that is to say, *we think* he gives us to understand—that he will proceed in the administration of the government precisely as though secession were only one of the superstitions of the dark ages. He will not recognize it as a fact, *because he cannot excuse it*. He will not recognize States as having revolted because he does not find any constitutional right to revolt.

Now, throwing all theories aside, we say that *to administer the government* upon this principle—to ignore the fact of secession or revolution, or what ever it may be called—in the execution of the federal laws, even to the qualified extent to which Mr. Lincoln pledges himself, *must involve the government in a war with the seceded States*. To this complexion it must come at last. Sooner or later we *must* realize that the South has gone out. We may call it revolution, or we may say, in reference to the right of it, as Mr. Lincoln says on another point—"The Constitution does not expressly say." But there stands secession—bold and palpable; and if we refuse to recognize it to-day, we shall have to recognize it, with arms

in our hands, to-morrow. It cannot long be dodged. There is an irrepressible conflict between the simple fact which stares us in the face when we look Southward, and the execution of the laws as proposed by the President.

And these considerations confirm us in the belief that the new President means *coercion*—coercion, we mean, in its offensive sense.

4. *Editorial on the Policy of the New Administration, in the New York Tribune, March 27, 1861.*⁵ The editorial began by asserting that there were but three possible ways in which to meet the secession movement.

1. By prompt, resolute, unflinching resistance. . . . 2. By complete acquiescence in . . . Secession. . . . 3. By a Fabian policy, which concedes nothing, yet employs no force in support of resisted Federal authority, hoping to wear out the insurgent spirit and in due time reestablish the authority of the Union throughout the revolted or seceded States, by virtue of the returning sanity and loyalty of their own people. We do not assume that this last is the wisest policy, nor yet that it has been resolved on by the new Administration; we propose simply to set forth the grounds on which it is commended and justified.

This Government, it is said, is based not on

force but on reason; not on bayonets and battalions, but on good will and general consent. . . . To war on the Seceders is to give to their yet vapory institutions the strong cement of blood—is to baptize their nationality in the mingled life-blood of friends and foes. But let them severely alone—allow them to wear out the military ardor of their adherents in fruitless drilling and marches, and to exhaust the patience of their fellow-citizens by the amount and frequency of their pecuniary exactions—and the fabric of their power will melt away like fog in the beams of a morning sun. Only give them rope, and they will speedily fulfill their destiny—the People, even of South Carolina, rejecting their sway as intolerable, and returning to the mild and paternal guardianship of the Union.

In behalf of this policy, it is urged that the Secessionists are a minority even in the seceded States; that they have grasped power by usurpation and retain it by terrorism; that they never dare submit the question of Union or Disunion fairly and squarely to the people, and always shun a popular vote when they can. In view of these facts, the Unionists of the South urge that the Government shall carry forbearance to the utmost, in the hope that the Nullifiers will soon be overwhelmed by the public sentiment of their own section, and driven with ignominy from power.

Part II.

THE OUTBREAK OF HOSTILITIES

Historians have long disputed whether or not Lincoln, considering war essential to the union, had planned to invoke military force at the opportune moment. Regardless of what he planned, war came in mid-April, beginning at one of the forts—Sumter—which had kept the Buchanan administration in constant anxiety for nearly three months.

At the time of South Carolina's secession, the United States had held three fortifications near Charleston: Fort Moultrie on the eastern side of the harbor, Fort Sumter rising from the waters of the harbor, and an antiquated fort known as Castle Pinckney. The federal garrison was too small to occupy more than one of these posts, and the commander, Major Robert Anderson, under orders to place his force in whichever position he deemed best, had moved secretly from Moultrie to Sumter on December 26, 1860. The South Carolinians, regarding this as an aggression, had demanded Anderson's withdrawal, thus precipitating a crisis in Buchanan's cabinet. The administration had refused to yield, and Anderson had remained at his new position.

This crisis had been followed by another in January, when the federal government sent an unarmed merchant ship, the *Star of the West*, with ammunition and reinforcements intended to strengthen Anderson. South Carolina's guns had opened fire on this vessel when she reached the entry to Charleston harbor and had forced her to turn back. Meanwhile, the Carolina forces, soon to be the Confederate forces, had sized Moultrie and Castle Pinckney and had erected numerous batteries directed against Sumter.

When Lincoln succeeded Buchanan, Anderson still remained at Sumter, but he was virtually besieged by the forces of the Confederate commander, Pierre G. T. Beauregard. The succession of dramatic episodes at Charleston had by this time focussed public attention sharply upon the Fort. Except for Fort Pickens at Pensacola, it was the only remaining bastion in the lower South which flew the American flag. This gave it great symbolical

value to the unionists, while Anderson's secret move and the attempt to reinforce had roused Confederate emotions to a high pitch. Here, as J. G. Randall remarks, "Peace hung upon a trigger."

On April 12, when Beauregard's batteries went into action and forced Anderson to capitulate, the public, which had endured weeks of crisis with an increasing sense of frustration, recognized the event as the end of peace and the beginning of war. The circumstances leading to this crucial act are reviewed in the passages that follow. Every detail of them has been the subject of sharp controversy, for unionists always stressed the fact that the Confederates struck the first blow. Confederates countered with the charge that Lincoln had promised to evacuate the fort and had then broken his promise, that he had upset the equilibrium of peace, which might have lasted indefinitely, by sending a relief expedition to Charleston, and that he had skillfully goaded the South to begin the hostilities which he himself desired.

A. LINCOLN'S ACCOUNT OF THE FIRING ON SUMTER

In an analysis of the complex and disputed events between March 4 and April 12, 1861, it is convenient to begin by examining a single account of the entire crisis. Lincoln gave such an account to Congress when it met in special session to deal with the business of war, and, although the critical historian would not accept his account without an analysis of other evidence, it provides both a coherent introduction to the crisis and an affirmation of facts on a number of pertinent points.

1. *Lincoln to Congress, July 4, 1861.*⁸

At the beginning of the present presidential term, four months ago, the functions of the Federal Government were found to be generally suspended within the several States of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Florida, excepting only those of the Post-office Department.

Within these States all the forts, arsenals, dockyards, custom-houses, and the like, including the movable and stationary property in and about them, had been seized, and were held in open hostility to this Government, excepting only Forts Pickens, Taylor, and Jefferson, on and near the Florida coast, and Fort Sumter, in Charleston Harbor, South Carolina. The forts thus seized had been put in improved condition, new ones had been built, and armed forces had been organized and were organizing, all avowedly with the same hostile purpose.

[In addition to mentioning the forts still held by the United States, Lincoln might have added that a naval vessel, the *Brooklyn*, was present in Pensacola harbor with troops on board. These troops could be sent into Fort Pickens, but in order to avoid the outbreak of fighting, the Buchanan administration had informally agreed to keep them on the vessel.]

The forts remaining in the possession of the Federal Government in and near these States were either besieged or menaced by warlike preparations, and especially Fort Sumter was nearly sur-

rounded by well-protected hostile batteries, with guns equal in quality to the best of its own, and outnumbering the latter as perhaps ten to one. A disproportionate share of the Federal muskets and rifles had somehow found their way into these States, and had been seized to be used against the Government. Accumulations of the public revenue, lying within them, had been seized for the same object. The Navy was scattered in distant seas, leaving but a very small part of it within the immediate reach of the Government. Officers of the Federal Army and Navy had resigned in great numbers; and of those resigning, a large proportion had taken up arms against the government. Simultaneously, and in connection with all this, the purpose to sever the Federal Union was openly avowed. In accordance with this purpose, an ordinance had been adopted in each of these States, declaring the States, respectively, to be separated from the National Union. A formula for instituting a combined government of these States had been promulgated; and this illegal organization in the character of confederate States, was already invoking recognition, aid, and intervention, from foreign powers.

Finding this condition of things, and believing it to be an imperative duty upon the incoming Executive to prevent, if possible, the consummation of such attempt to destroy the Federal Union, a choice of means to that end became indispensable. This choice was made, and was declared in the inaugural address. The policy chosen looked to the exhaustion of all peaceful measures, before

a resort to any stronger ones. It sought only to hold the public places and property not already wrested from the Government, and to collect the revenue, relying for the rest on time, discussion, and the ballot-box. It promised a continuance of the mails, at Government expense, to the very people who were resisting the Government; and it gave repeated pledges against any disturbance to any of the people, or any of their rights. Of all that which a President might constitutionally and justifiably do in such a case, everything was forborne, without which it was believed possible to keep the government on foot.

On the 5th of March, (the present incumbent's first full day in office,) a letter of Major Anderson, commanding at Fort Sumter, written on the 28th of February, and received at the War Department on the 4th of March, was, by that Department, placed in his hands. This letter expressed the professional opinion of the writer, that reinforcements could not be thrown into that fort within the time for his relief, rendered necessary by the limited supply of provisions, and with a view of holding possession of the same, with a force of less than twenty thousand good and well disciplined men. This opinion was concurred in by all the officers of his command, and their *memoranda* on the subject were made inclosures of Major Anderson's letter.

The whole was immediately laid before Lieutenant General Scott, who at once concurred with Major Anderson in opinion. On reflection, however, he took full time, consulting with other officers, both of the Army and the Navy, and, at the end of four days, came reluctantly, but decidedly, to the same conclusion as before. He also stated at the same time that no such sufficient force was then at the control of the Government, or could be raised and brought to the ground within the time when the provisions in the fort would be exhausted. In a purely military point of view, this reduced the duty of the Administration in the case, to the mere matter of getting the garrison out of the fort.

It was believed, however, that to so abandon that position, under the circumstances, would be utterly ruinous; that the *necessity* under which it was to be done would not be fully understood; that by many it would be construed as a part of a *voluntary* policy; that at home it would discourage the friends of the Union, embolden its adversaries, and go far to insure to the latter a recognition abroad; that, in fact, it would be our national destruction consummated. This could not be allowed. Starvation was not yet upon the garrison; and ere it would be reached *Fort Pickens*

might be reinforced. This last would be a clear indication of *policy*, and would better enable the country to accept the evacuation of Fort Sumter as a military *necessity*. An order was at once directed to be sent for the landing of the troops from the steamship Brooklyn into Fort Pickens. This order could not go by land, but must take the longer and slower route by sea. The first return news from the order was received just one week before the fall of Fort Sumter. The news itself was that the officer commanding the Sabine, to which vessel the troops had been transferred from the Brooklyn, acting upon some *quasi* armistice of the late Administration, (and of the existence of which the present Administration, up to the time the order was despatched, had only too vague and uncertain rumors to fix attention,) had refused to land the troops. To now reinforce Fort Pickens before a crisis would be reached at Fort Sumter was impossible—rendered so by the near exhaustion of provisions in the latter-named fort. In precaution against such a conjuncture, the Government had a few days before commenced preparing an expedition, as well adapted as might be, to relieve Fort Sumter, which expedition was intended to be ultimately used or not, according to circumstances. The strongest anticipated case for using it was now presented; and it was resolved to send it forward. As had been intended in this contingency, it was also resolved to notify the Governor of South Carolina that he might expect an attempt would be made to provision the fort; and that, if the attempt should not be resisted, there would be no effort to throw in men, arms, or ammunition, without further notice, or in case of an attack upon the fort. This notice was accordingly given; whereupon the fort was attacked and bombarded to its fall, without even awaiting the arrival of the provisioning expedition.

It is thus seen that the assault upon and reduction of Fort Sumter was in no sense a matter of self defense on the part of the assailants. They well knew that the garrison in the fort could by no possibility commit aggression upon them. They knew—they were expressly notified—that the giving of bread to the few brave and hungry men of the garrison was all which would on that occasion be attempted, unless themselves, by resisting so much, should provoke more. They knew that this Government desired to keep the garrison in the fort, not to assail them, but merely to maintain visible possession, and thus to preserve the Union from actual and immediate dissolution—trusting, as hereinbefore stated, to time, discussion, and the ballot-box for final adjustment.

B.

THE PROPOSED EVACUATION OF SUMTER

In Lincoln's own statement of the circumstances leading to the outbreak of war, he indicated that he would have been willing, in certain circumstances, to withdraw from Fort Sumter. This assertion is extremely significant as an indication that the administration was not at the beginning irrevocably committed to holding the position at which war later began. Was this true? Did Lincoln ever make explicit offers or plans directed toward withdrawal from the Fort? If so, what reasons impelled him to such a move? And what other reasons ultimately dissuaded him and caused him to send a naval expedition to the relief of the Fort?

These questions involve two factors. First is the problem of the separate status of Fort Sumter alone. Was the Fort tenable in a military sense? As a matter of tactics, could it be successfully defended? Aside from tactics, was there any political advantage to be gained by yielding at this point and maintaining the principle of union in some other form? Second is the problem of the close relationship between Fort Pickens and Fort Sumter. Lincoln himself asserts that the abandonment of Sumter was contingent on the assurance of holding Fort Pickens. If so, why was not Pickens reinforced, so that Sumter could be abandoned? The first of these problems is treated in the following selections. The second will be dealt with in Section C.

1. *Lincoln's Pre-inaugural Attitude on the Sumter Question.* One of the people who discussed the Sumter question with Lincoln shortly before the inaugural was C. S. Morehead, a former governor of Kentucky, who was in Washington as a delegate to the peace conference. He and other delegates had a meeting with Lincoln, which he described in a letter, February 23, to John J. Crittenden.⁹

Under this painful feeling, when invited to an interview with Mr. Lincoln, in company with Messrs. Rives and Somers, of Virginia, Doniphan, of Missouri, and Guthrie, of Kentucky, I ventured to express to him my sense of the dreadful impending danger, and entreated and *implored* him to avert it. I said to him that he held the destiny of more than thirty millions of people in his hands; that if he acted the part of a wise statesman, in avoiding a collision, he would occupy a place in the future history of his country second only to Washington; but, on the other hand, if he adopted a policy which would lead to war, that the history of his administration would be written in blood, and all the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans could not wash it from his hands; that the true and wise policy was to withdraw the troops from Fort Sumter, and give satisfactory guarantees to the eight remaining slaveholding States, and that the seven seceding States would, not at once, but ultimately, by the mere force of gravitation, come back, and we should have a safer and firmer bond of union than ever. Mr. Rives pressed the same idea, when Mr. Lincoln said he would withdraw the troops if Virginia would stay in the Union. I took occasion to write down the entire conversation soon after

it occurred. The impression undoubtedly left upon my mind was, that the new administration would not resort to coercion. This was still further strengthened by the voluntary pledge of honor of Mr. Seward, in the presence of Mr. Taylor, of Washington, and Messrs. Rives and Somers, that there should be no collision. "Nay," said he to me, "if this whole matter is not satisfactorily settled within sixty days after I am seated in the saddle, and hold the reins firmly in my hand, I will give you my head for a football." These were the identical words used, as I put them on paper in less than two hours after they were uttered.

2. *More Evidence on the Alleged Assurance.* The private diary of John Hay, Lincoln's personal secretary, has this description of a conversation that took place at the home of the Secretary of State on October 22, 1861.¹⁰

At Seward's tonight the President talked about secession, compromise, and other such. He spoke of a committee of Southern pseudo-Unionists coming to him before Inauguration for guarantees &c. He promised to evacuate Sumter if they would break up their convention, without any row or nonsense. They demurred. Subsequently he renewed proposition to Sumners, but without any result. The President was most anxious to prevent bloodshed.

3. *As Welles Saw It.* Gideon Welles, who, as Lincoln's Secretary of the Navy, was in a position to know what went on in the cabinet, kept a diary also. The notations that follow were not really part of his daily record but were included in a narrative which he wrote at a later time.¹¹

Mr. Seward, who from the first had viewed with no favor any attempt to relieve Sumter, soon became a very decisive and emphatic opponent of any proposition that was made; said he had entertained doubts, and the opinion and arguments of Major Anderson and his officers, confirmed by the distinguished military officers who were consulted, had fully convinced him that it would be abortive and useless. It was a duty to defer to these military gentlemen, whose profession and study made them experts, who had by long and faithful service justly acquired the positions they held, and who possessed the confidence of the country. It was, he was satisfied, impossible to relieve and reinforce the garrison; the attempt would provoke immediate hostilities, and if hostilities could not be avoided, he deemed it important that the Administration should not strike the first blow.

The President, though much distressed with the conclusions of the military officers, and the decisive concurrence of the Secretary of State in those conclusions, appeared to acquiesce in what seemed to be a military necessity, but was not disposed to yield until the last moment, and when there was no hope of accomplishing the work if attempted. In the mean time, he sent Mr. Lamon, his late law-partner, to Charleston and others also to make inquiries. . . .

Postmaster-General Blair, who had been a close and near observer of what had taken place through the winter and spring, took an opposite view from Mr. Seward and General Scott. . . . As the subject was discussed, and the impossibility and inutility of the scheme [to reinforce] was urged, with the assurance from the first military men in the country, whose advice was sought and given, that it was a military necessity to leave Sumter to its fate, the opinions of men changed, or they began at least to waver. Mr. Blair saw these misgivings, in which he did not at all participate, and finally, observing that the President, with the acquiescence of the Cabinet, was about adopting the Seward and Scott policy, he wrote his resignation, determined not to continue in the Cabinet if no attempt was made to relieve Fort Sumter.

4. *Public Opinion and Expectation on the Proposed Evacuation of Sumter.* On this point the sources are numerous, and it is not practicable to quote enough to show the state of the public mind. However, the following secondary account, based on a variety of sources, will serve to suggest the composite picture.¹²

[There was] a widespread and unqualified belief that the question was settled. An Associated Press dispatch of March 19 announced that evacuation had been ordered for the next day. The *Tribune's* Charleston correspondent reported that

"the authenticated report" that the fort would be abandoned "affords inexpressible relief to hundreds of families . . . that had husbands and brothers in the rebel ranks." Joseph Holt and Edwin Stanton, in letters to Buchanan, assured him of the same decision. From New York, John A. Dix wrote of the bad effects of "the intelligence that Fort Sumter is to be abandoned." But the stock exchange regarded it as good news, and securities rose.

The complete credence with which the public accepted these reports is shown by a tendency to regard the evacuation almost as an accomplished fact. Among the correspondents of Chase, for instance, one wrote, "The news received yesterday was anything but pleasant. The surrender of the forts will give great dissatisfaction." Another said, "You . . . have no idea of the despondency and discouragement of the Republicans . . . in this part of the country." On April 1, the Republicans lost a State election in Ohio, and they were prompt to attribute this defeat to the situation at Sumter. One of them wrote, "Ohio yesterday spoke in thunder tones against the surrendering of Fort Sumter [*sic*]. . . . It is to us a Waterloo defeat, and all know that the supposed evacuation . . . is what did it." Similarly, Rutherford B. Hayes declared, "Yes, giving up Fort Sumter is vexing. It hurts our little election, too."

It is clearly evident that a general understanding existed that Major Anderson was to be withdrawn. It is also evident that Lincoln shared in this understanding, for he told Francis P. Blair, Sr., that it had not yet been fully decided, but that the cabinet was almost a unit in favor of it and "that he thought such would be the result."

5. *A Turning Point.* Lincoln's view of the Sumter question appears to have changed late in March as he gained in ability to appraise the advice which he received from the head of the army, General Winfield Scott. Scott was a military hero both of the War of 1812 and the Mexican War, and Lincoln had felt impelled to accept his word as final on all military questions; civilian amateurs, it was assumed, were not competent to question the professional opinion of a military expert on questions of strategy and tactics. Late in March, however, Scott prepared for Lincoln an undated memorandum which caused Lincoln to doubt whether Scott's opinions were based upon purely military considerations.¹³

It seems from the opinions of the Army officers who expressed themselves on the subject—all within Fort Sumter, together with Generals Scott and Totten—that it is perhaps now impossible to succor that fort substantially, if at all, without capturing, by means of a large expedition of

ships of war and troops, all the opposing batteries of South Carolina. In the mean time—six or ten months—Major Anderson would almost certainly have been obliged to surrender under assault or the approach of starvation; for even if an expedition like that proposed by G. V. Fox should succeed *once* in throwing in the succor of a few men and a few weeks' provisions, the necessity for repeating the latter supply would return again and again, including the yellow-fever season. An abandonment of the fort in a few weeks, sooner or later, would appear, therefore, to be a sure necessity, and if so, the sooner the more graceful on the part of the Government.

It is doubtful, however, according to recent information from the South, whether the voluntary evacuation of Fort Sumter alone would have a decisive effect upon the States now wavering between adherence to the Union and secession. It is known, indeed, that it would be charged to necessity, and the holding of Fort Pickens would be adduced in support of that view. Our Southern friends, however, are clear that the evacuation of both the forts would instantly soothe and give confidence to the eight remaining slaveholding States, and render their cordial adherence to this Union perpetual.

The holding of Forts Jefferson and Taylor, on the ocean keys, depends on entirely different principles, and should never be abandoned; and, indeed, the giving up of Forts Sumter and Pickens may be best justified by the hope that we should thereby recover the State to which they geographically belong by the liberality of the act, besides retaining the eight doubtful States.

6. *Lincoln's Reaction to the Scott Memorandum.* Montgomery Blair, Lincoln's Postmaster General, was at the White House with a group of other cabinet members on the evening of March 28, 1861, the day the President received the memorandum. He described the incident in a letter of May 6, 1882.¹⁴

General Scott, in the belief that the surrender of Fort Sumter had been determined upon, wrote to the President that it was necessary to surrender Fort Pickens also.

This letter was written on the day fixed for the final action on the question, whether Sumter

should be surrendered. But contrary to the President's previous intention, he did not decide the question at the Cabinet meeting that day. After dinner the President called the members out of the room where he had dined with them, and in an agitated manner read Scott's letter, which he seemed just to have received. An oppressive silence followed. At last I said, "Mr. President you can now see that General Scott, in advising the surrender of Fort Sumter, is playing the part of a politician, not of a general, for as no one pretends that there is any military necessity for the surrender of Fort Pickens, which he now says it is equally necessary to surrender, it is believed that he is governed by political reasons in both recommendations."

No answer could be made to this point, and the President saw that he was misled, and immediately ordered the reinforcement of Fort Sumter. It is impossible to exaggerate the importance and merit of this act. It was an irrevocable decision that the Union should be maintained by force of arms. It was assuming the greatest responsibility ever assumed by any man, and it was assumed by Lincoln with only the support of a single member of the Cabinet, and he represented no State, and was the youngest and least distinguished member; and he was opposed by all the others, who were the leaders of the Republican party, and the representative men of the great Republican States. Lincoln himself was inexperienced, and those who opposed the stand he took had not only great experience in public affairs, but they were regarded by Lincoln himself as his superiors. That he should resolve to stand by his convictions of duty against all these influences ought, and I believe will, crown him with immortal honor.

7. *The Next Step.* On the following day Lincoln sent this order to the War Department.¹⁵

EXECUTIVE MANSION, March 29. 1861
Honorable SECRETARY OF WAR:

SIR: I desire that an expedition, to move by sea, be got ready to sail as early as the 6th of April next, the whole according to memorandum attached, and that you co-operate with the Secretary of the Navy for that object.

Your obedient servant,

A. LINCOLN.

C. SUMTER AND PICKENS: INTERCHANGEABLE SYMBOLS OF UNION

Although Lincoln ordered the *preparation* of an expedition to be *ready* to sail to the relief of Sumter as early as April 6, he did not order the actual sending of the expedition. His hesitancy may have been motivated by several reasons, but certainly an important factor was his anxiety to know about the situation at Fort Pickens, Pensacola. Lincoln distinctly wanted to retain at least one fort as a symbol of the maintenance of the union. In proportion as the federal position at Pickens became stronger, the retention of Sumter

became less essential; if Pickens were not securely held Sumter became indispensable. The developments at Pensacola were therefore vital.

When Lincoln took office, affairs at Pensacola harbor were in a state resembling suspended animation, for an informal truce had been agreed upon by the Buchanan administration and the Confederacy. At the time of its adoption, a small military force under the command of Captain Israel Vogdes had reached Pensacola by sea but was being held on ship-board. Rather than precipitate an issue, the Buchanan administration had held these troops where they were, making no attempt to throw them into the Fort. Consequently Lincoln as commander in chief inherited from Buchanan a small force already on the scene, available to reinforce Fort Pickens. This force was subject to War Department orders but could not act without naval cooperation. The events which followed were not what anyone intended.

1. *Lincoln's First Steps in Relation to Fort Pickens* are described by his personal secretaries, John G. Nicolay and John Hay.¹⁶

When Lincoln assumed the duties of government, Scott had among other things briefly pointed out the existing danger at Fort Pickens, and the President by his verbal order of March 5, directing "all possible vigilance for the maintenance of all the places," had intended that that stronghold should be promptly reënforced. He made inquiries on this head four days later, and to his surprise found nothing yet done. Hence he put his order in writing, and sent it to the War Department for record March 11, and once more gave special directions in regard to Pickens, assuming the omission had occurred through preoccupation about Sumter. Upon this reminder, Scott bestirred himself, and at his instance the war steamer *Mohawk* was dispatched, March 12, carrying a messenger with orders to Captain Vogdes to land his company at Fort Pickens and increase the garrison. [*The Mohawk was first assigned for this mission, but was shifted to another assignment, and the message was sent by another vessel, the Crusader.*] Both President and Cabinet had since then considered that point disposed of for the moment.

2. *Instructions of the War Department to Captain Vogdes.*¹⁷

HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY,
Washington, March 12, 1861.

"Captain VOGDES, U. S. Army,
On board U. S. sloop-of-war *Brooklyn*, lying off
Fort Pickens:

SIR: At the first favorable moment you will land with your company, re-enforce Fort Pickens, and hold the same till further orders. Report frequently, if opportunities present themselves, on the condition of the fort and the circumstances around you.

I write by command of Lieutenant-General Scott.

I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

E. D. TOWNSEND,
Assistant Adjutant-General."

3. *The Navy Reports.* After March 12 no reliable information of affairs at Fort Pickens reached the administration until the Navy Department received the following letter from Captain H. A. Adams, aboard whose ship the army force under Captain Vogdes had been quartered. This letter was sent by a special courier who traveled overland by rail.¹⁸

U. S. FRIGATE SABINE,
Off Pensacola, April 1, 1861.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose a copy of a letter addressed to me by Captain Vogdes, U. S. Army, who is here in command of some troops sent out in January last to reenforce the garrison of Fort Pickens. I have declined to land the men as Captain Vogdes requests, as it would be in direct violation of the orders from the Navy Department under which I am acting.

The instructions from General Scott to Captain Vogdes are of old date (March 12) and may have been given without a full knowledge of the condition of affairs here. They would be no justification to me. Such a step is too important to be taken without the clearest orders from proper authority. It would most certainly be viewed as a hostile act, and would be resisted to the utmost. No one acquainted with the feelings of the military assembled under General Bragg can doubt that it would be considered not only a declaration but an act of war. It would be a serious thing to bring on by any precipitation a collision which may be entirely against the wishes of the Administration.

At present both sides are faithfully observing the agreement entered into by the U. S. Government with Mr. Mallory and Colonel Chase. This agreement binds us not to reenforce Fort Pickens unless it shall be attacked or threatened. It binds them not to attack it unless we should attempt to reenforce it. I saw General Bragg on the 30th

ultimo, who reassured me the conditions on their part should not be violated. While I can not take on myself under such insufficient authority as General Scott's order the fearful responsibility of an act which seems to render civil war inevitable, I am ready at all times to carry out whatever orders I may receive from the honorable Secretary of the Navy.

In conclusion, I beg you will please send me instructions as soon as possible, that I may be relieved from a painful embarrassment.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

H. A. ADAMS,

Captain, Senior Officer, Present.

Hon. GIDEON WELLES,

Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

[Enclosure.]

U. S. FRIGATE SABINE,

Off Pensacola, Fla., April 1, 1861.

SIR: Herewith I send you a copy of an order received by me last night. You will see by it that I am directed to land my command at the earliest opportunity. I have therefore to request that you will place at my disposal such boats and other means as will enable me to carry into effect the enclosed order.

Yours, etc.,

I. VOGDES,

Captain, First Artillery, Commanding.

Captain H. A. ADAMS,

Commanding Naval Forces off Pensacola.

4. *Reply to Adams. Captain Adams' letter*

was written on April 1. When was it received at Washington? Lincoln makes a statement on this point in his message to Congress, and his statement may be checked by the following letter of instructions from Secretary Welles to Captain Adams. It is of interest to note that, under the instructions, Fort Pickens was reinforced on April 12 and was held by the union throughout the war. By a supreme irony, events at Sumter reached a final crisis on the same day on which Pickens was reinforced. This message also was sent by special courier traveling by rail.¹⁹

Confidential.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *April 6, 1861.*

SIR: Your dispatch of April 1 is received. The Department regrets that you did not comply with the request of Captain Vogdes to carry into effect the orders of General Scott sent out by the *Cru-sader* under the orders of the Department.

You will immediately on the first favorable opportunity after receipt of this order afford every facility to Captain Vogdes by boats and other means to enable him to land the troops under his command, it being the wish and intention of the Navy Department to cooperate with the War Department in that object.

I am, sir, respectfully, etc.,

GIDEON WELLES,

Secretary of the Navy.

Captain HENRY A. ADAMS,

Commanding Naval Forces off Pensacola.

D. THE FINAL CRISIS AT SUMTER

Lincoln's order of March 29 had called for the preparation of a force to be "used or not," as he afterward declared, "according to circumstances." It was not, however, this preparation of a force, but the dispatching of the force to Charleston which marked a critical decision. The final steps in the decision to send the Sumter expedition, in its sailing, and in the fateful consequences which ensued, are indicated in the following documents.

1. *Instructions of the Secretary of War to Captain Gustavus V. Fox of the U. S. Navy April 4, 1861.*²⁰

SIR: It having been determined to succor Fort Sumter, you have been selected for this important duty. Accordingly, you will take charge of the transports provided in New York, having the troops and supplies on board, to the entrance of Charleston Harbor, and endeavor, in the first instance, to deliver the subsistence. If you are opposed in this you are directed to report the fact to the senior naval officer off the harbor, who will be instructed by the Secretary of the Navy to use his entire force to open a passage, when you will,

if possible, effect an entrance and place both the troops and supplies in Fort Sumter.

I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

SIMON CAMERON,

Secretary of War

2. *Instructions of the Secretary of the Navy to Captain Samuel Mercer, U. S. Navy, April 5, 1861.*²¹

SIR: The U. S. steamers *Powhatan*, *Pawnee*, *Pocahontas*, and *Harriet Lane* will compose a naval force, under your command, to be sent to the vicinity of Charleston, S. C., for the purpose of aiding in carrying out the objects of an expedi-

tion of which the War Department has charge.

The primary object of the expedition is to provision Fort Sumter, for which purpose the War Department will furnish the necessary transports. Should the authorities at Charleston permit the fort to be supplied, no further particular service will be required of the force under your command, and after being satisfied that supplies have been received at the fort the *Powhatan*, *Pocahontas*, and *Harriet Lane* will return to New York and the *Pawnee* to Washington.

Should the authorities at Charleston, however, refuse to permit or attempt to prevent the vessel or vessels having supplies on board from entering the harbor or from peaceably proceeding to Fort Sumter, you will protect the transports or boats of the expedition in the object of their mission, disposing of your force in such manner as to open the way for their ingress, and afford, so far as practicable, security to the men and boats, and repelling by force, if necessary, all obstructions toward provisioning the fort and reenforcing it; for in case of resistance to the peaceable primary object of the expedition a reenforcement of the garrison will also be attempted.

These purposes will be under the supervision of the War Department, which has charge of the expedition. The expedition has been intrusted to Captain G. V. Fox, with whom you will put yourself in communication, and cooperate with him to accomplish and carry into effect its object.

You will leave New York with the *Powhatan* in time to be off Charleston bar, 10 miles distant from and due east of the light-house, on the morning of the 11th instant, there to await the arrival of the transport or transports with troops and stores. The *Pawnee* and *Pocahontas* will be ordered to join you there at the time mentioned, and also the *Harriet Lane*, which latter vessel has been placed under the control of this Department for this service. On the termination of the expedition, whether it be peaceable or otherwise, the several vessels under your command will return to the respective ports, as above directed, unless some unforeseen circumstances should prevent.

I am, respectfully, your obedient servant,
GIDEON WELLES
Secretary Navy.

3. *Report of Captain Gustavus V. Fox, February 24, 1865, on His Command of the Sumter Expedition.*²²

[Preparations for the Expedition]

On the 30th of March the President sent me to New York with verbal instructions to prepare for the voyage, but to make no binding engagements. . . .

On the 2d of April I had not received the written authority which I expected from the Government; therefore I returned to Washington.

Delays which belong to the secret history of this period prevented a decision until the afternoon of the 4th of April, when the President sent for me and said that he had decided to let the expedition go, and that a messenger from himself would be sent to the authorities of Charleston before I could possibly get there, to notify them that no troops would be thrown into Sumter if provisions were allowed peacefully to be sent to the garrison. I mentioned to the President that by the time I should arrive at New York I would have but nine days in which to charter and provision the vessels and reach the destined point, 632 miles distant.

He answered that I should best fulfill my duty to my country to make the attempt.

[The Sailing of the Expedition]

The frigate *Powhatan*, Captain Mercer, sailed on the 6th of April, 1861; the *Pawnee*, Commander Rowan, on the 9th; the *Pocahontas*, Captain Gillis, on the 10th; the *Harriet Lane*, Captain Faunce, on the 8th; the tug *Uncle Ben* on the 7th; the tug *Yankee* on the 8th, and the *Baltic*, Captain Fletcher, dropped down to Sandy Hook on the evening of the 8th and went to sea at 8 a.m. of the 9th. . . .

Soon after leaving Sandy Hook a heavy gale of wind set in, which continued during the whole passage. At 3 a.m. of the 12th we reached the rendezvous off Charleston and communicated with the *Harriet Lane*, the only vessel which had arrived; at 6 a.m. the *Pawnee* was seen standing in. I boarded her and informed her commander of my orders to offer to send in provisions, and asked him to stand in to the bar with me. He replied that his orders required him to remain 10 miles east of the light and await the *Powhatan*, and that he was not going in there to inaugurate civil war. I then stood in toward the bar, followed by the *Harriet Lane*, Captain Faunce, who cheerfully accompanied me. As we neared the land heavy guns were heard and the smoke and shells from the batteries which had just opened fire upon Sumter were distinctly visible. . . . The weather continued very bad, with a heavy sea. . . .

. . . a great volume of black smoke issued from Fort Sumter, through which the flash of Major Anderson's guns still replied to the rebel fire. The quarters of the fort were on fire, and most of our military and naval officers believed the smoke to proceed from an attempt to smoke out the garrison with fire rafts. As it was the opinion of the officers that no boats with any load in them could have reached Sumter in this heavy sea, and no tugboats had arrived, it was proposed

to capture a schooner near us loaded with ice, which was done, and preparations at once commenced to fit her out and load her for entering the harbor the following night. . . . At 2 p.m. the *Pocahontas* arrived, and at 2:30 the flag of Sumter was shot away and not again raised. A flag of truce was sent in by Captain Gillis, and arrangements made to place Major Anderson and his command on board the *Baltic* to return North.

4. *Letter of Lincoln to Major Anderson, Dated April 4, 1861.* Four copies of this letter were prepared. One was sent by regular mail and reached Anderson on April 7, which means that it left Washington probably on April 4, and not later than April 5. Another copy was sent by a special courier, Captain Theodore Talbot, who left Washington on April 6, reached Charleston April 8, was not allowed to deliver his letter, and returned to Washington. Some writers, overlooking the first letter, have supposed that the message was not sent until April 6, and that it was never delivered. Both ideas are in error.²³

Washington, April 4, 1861.

Sir: Your letter of the 1st instant occasions some anxiety to the President.

On the information of Captain Fox, he had supposed you could hold out till the 15th instant without any great inconvenience, and had prepared an expedition to relieve you before that period.

Hoping still that you will be able to sustain yourself till the 11th or 12th instant, the expedition will go forward, and, finding your flag flying, will attempt to provision you, and in case the effort is resisted, will endeavor also to reinforce you.

You will therefore hold out, if possible, till the arrival of the expedition.

It is not, however, the intention of the President to subject your command to any danger or hardship beyond what, in your judgment, would be usual in military life; and he has entire confidence that you will act as becomes a patriot and a soldier under all circumstances.

Whenever, if at all, in your judgment, to save yourself and command, a capitulation becomes a necessity, you are authorized to make it.

5. *Letter of Lincoln to Robert S. Chew, Special Messenger of the State Department, Dated April 6, 1861.*²⁴

Washington, April 6, 1861.

Sir: You will proceed directly to Charleston, South Carolina, and if, on your arrival there, the flag of the United States shall be flying over Fort Sumter, and the fort shall not have been attacked, you will procure an interview with Governor Pickens, and read to him as follows: "I am directed by the President of the United States to notify

you to expect an attempt will be made to supply Fort Sumter with provisions only; and that, if such attempt be not resisted, no effort to throw in men, arms, or ammunition will be made without further notice, or in case of an attack upon the fort."

After you shall have read this to Governor Pickens, deliver to him the copy of it herein inclosed, and retain this letter yourself.

But if, on your arrival at Charleston, you shall ascertain that Fort Sumter shall have been already evacuated, or surrendered by the United States force, or shall have been attacked by an opposing force, you will seek no interview with Governor Pickens, but return here forthwith.

6. *Letter of Captain Theodore Talbot, United States Army, to the Secretary of War, April 12, 1861.*²⁵

WASHINGTON, D. C. April 12, 1861.

Hon. SIMON CAMERON, *Secretary of War*:

SIR: I have the honor to report that in obedience to your instructions, dated April 6, 1861, I left Washington on the evening of the same day in company with Mr. R. S. Chew, and arrived at Charleston, S. C., on the evening of the 8th instant. Immediately after my arrival I visited Governor Pickens, and, having informed him of the nature of my written instructions, stated that Mr. Chew had requested me to ask his excellency for an interview at his earliest convenience. The governor replied that he would receive Mr. Chew at once, and shortly after I accompanied Mr. Chew to the governor's quarters. Mr. Chew read to the governor, in my presence, a message from the President of the United States, handing him a copy of the same, which was compared by the governor. The governor stated to Mr. Chew that, South Carolina having ratified the constitution of the Confederate States, General Beauregard now had charge of military affairs in the vicinity of Charleston, and that, as General Beauregard was near at hand, he would desire to have him present at the interview. To this Mr. Chew assented, and General Beauregard having been called into the room, the governor read and handed to him the copy of the message which he had just received.

7. *Letter of General Beauregard to Major Anderson, April 11, 1861.*²⁶

SIR: The Government of the Confederate States has hitherto forbore from any hostile demonstration against Fort Sumter, in the hope that the Government of the United States, with a view to the amicable adjustment of all questions between the two Governments, and to avert the calamities of war, would voluntarily evacuate it.

There was reason at one time to believe that such would be the course pursued by the Government of the United States, and under that

impression my Government has refrained from making any demand for the surrender of the fort. But the Confederate States can no longer delay assuming actual possession of a fortification commanding the entrance of one of their harbors, and necessary to its defense and security.

I am ordered by the Government of the Confederate States to demand the evacuation of Fort Sumter. My aides, Colonel Chesnut and Captain Lee, are authorized to make such demand of you. All proper facilities will be afforded for the removal of yourself and command, together with company arms and property, and all private property, to any post in the United States which you may select. The flag which you have upheld so long and with so much fortitude, under the most trying circumstances, may be saluted by you on taking it down.

Colonel Chesnut and Captain Lee will, for a reasonable time, await your answer.

I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

8. *Reply of Major Anderson to General Beauregard, April 11, 1861.*²⁷

GENERAL: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication demanding the evacuation of this fort, and to say, in reply thereto, that it is a demand with which I regret that my sense of honor, and of my obligations to my Government, prevent my compliance. Thanking you for the fair, manly, and courteous terms proposed, and for the high compliment paid me,

I am, general, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

9. *Second Letter of Beauregard to Anderson, April 11, 1861.*²⁸

HEADQUARTERS PROVISIONAL
ARMY, C. S. A.

Charleston, S. C., April 11, 1861.

MAJOR: In consequence of the verbal observation made by you to my aides, Messrs. Chesnut and Lee, in relation to the condition of your supplies, and that you would in a few days be starved out if our guns did not batter you to pieces, or words to that effect, and desiring no useless effusion of blood, I communicated both the verbal observations and your written answer to my communications to my Government.

If you will state the time at which you will evacuate Fort Sumter, and agree that in the mean

time you will not use your guns against us unless ours shall be employed against Fort Sumter, we will abstain from opening fire upon you. Colonel Chesnut and Captain Lee are authorized by me to enter into such an agreement with you. You are, therefore, requested to communicate to them an open answer.

I remain, major, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

G. T. BEAUREGARD,
Brigadier-General, Commanding.

10. *Second Response of Anderson to Beauregard, April 12, 1861.*²⁹

FORT SUMTER, S. C. *April 12, 1861.*

GENERAL: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt by Colonel Chesnut of your second communication of the 11th instant, and to state in reply that, cordially uniting with you in the desire to avoid the useless effusion of blood, I will, if provided with the proper and necessary means of transportation, evacuate Fort Sumter by noon on the 15th instant, and that I will not in the mean time open my fires upon your forces unless compelled to do so by some hostile act against this fort or the flag of my Government by the forces under your command, or by some portion of them, or by the perpetration of some act showing hostile intention on your part against this fort or the flag it bears, should I not receive prior to that time controlling instructions from my Government or additional supplies.

I am, general, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

11. *Letter of James Chesnut, Jr., and Stephen D. Lee, Aides-de-camp of General Beauregard, to Major Anderson, April 12, 1861.*³⁰

FORT SUMTER, S. C., *April 12, 1861—3.20a.m.*

SIR: By authority of Brigadier-General Beauregard, commanding the Provisional Forces of the Confederate States, we have the honor to notify you that he will open the fire of his batteries on Fort Sumter in one hour from this time.

We have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servants,

JAMES CHESNUT, JR.,
Aide-de-Camp.

STEPHEN D. LEE,
Captain, C. S. Army, Aide-de-Camp.

Maj. ROBERT ANDERSON,
U. S. Army, Commanding Fort Sumter.

E. DID THE LINCOLN ADMINISTRATION VIOLATE A PLEDGE TO EVACUATE SUMTER?

In March 1861 the Confederate government sent commissioners to Washington with instructions to secure, if possible, recognition of Confederate independence and the transfer of Forts Pickens and Sumter to Confederate possession. If this mission should fail, it was clear that an attack on the forts might result. Both Lincoln and Secretary of State Seward wanted to avert any such clash; in fact Seward was perfectly willing to evacuate Fort Sumter, for he had great faith in the latent unionist sentiment in the South, which he believed would soon bring about a reaction leading to the voluntary return of the South to the union. Expecting, as almost everyone did, that Sumter would be evacuated, Seward was eager to forestall a clash by informing the Confederates of the anticipated event, but it was diplomatically impossible for him to receive them or even to hold any direct communication with them. The problem of communication was solved, however, when an intermediary appeared in the person of Justice John A. Campbell of the Supreme Court, an Alabamian who later went with the Confederacy. Campbell afterward wrote a statement of his dealings with Seward,³¹ which is generally accepted as factually correct, though interpretations of the matter have varied widely. His account begins with the statement that on March 15 he and Justice Nelson called on Seward to urge that the Confederate commissioners be received.

Mr. Seward heard what we said with courtesy and attention, and replied to it: That not a member of the Cabinet would consent. "Talk with Montgomery Blair and Mr. Bates, with Mr. Lincoln himself, they are Southern men, and see what they say," said Mr. S. No one of them would agree. "No," he proceeded, "if Jefferson Davis had known of the state of things here, he never would have sent those Commissioners. It is enough to deal with one thing at a time. The surrender of Sumter is enough to deal with." He took from his table a letter from Mr. Weed, whom he described to be a statesman and a patriot, and read to this effect: "That the surrender of Sumter was a bitter pill; that it would damage the party in the elections; that he was sure he could have made a better arrangement with the Commissioners; that they would have been willing to allow Major Anderson's force to remain in the fort, without molestation, to purchase supplies in Charleston, and his regret was for having left Washington before something had been concluded."

I had not before this had a hint of the proposed evacuation of Sumter, and replied to Mr. Seward that I fully agreed with him that only one matter should be dealt with at a time and that the evacuation of Sumter was a sufficient burden upon the Administration; that too much circumspection could not be employed to prevent agitation or excitement of the public mind. I said I would see the Commissioners on the subject and also write to Mr. Davis. "What shall I say on the subject of Fort Sumter?" He said: "You may say to him that before that letter reaches him (how far is it to Montgomery?)" "Three days." "You may say to him that before that letter reaches

him the telegraph will have informed him that Fort Sumter will have been evacuated." "What shall I say as to the forts in the Gulf of Mexico?" He said: "We contemplate no action as to them; we are satisfied with the position of things there." I agreed to see the Commissioners on that day, and to obtain their consent to a delay of their demand for an answer to their letter, and would afford him an answer. Mr. S. said he must have an answer that day, and if I were successful I might prevent a civil war.

I called upon Mr. Crawford, one of the commissioners, and informed him that I desired to write a letter to Mr. Davis; . . . After some discussion he consented to my request, provided I would assure him on the subject of Sumter, and he required my authority for my assertion, informing me at the same time that he was satisfied that it was Mr. Seward. I declined to give him any name and told him that he was not authorized to infer that I was acting under any agency; that I was responsible to him for what I told him and that no other person was. I informed him that Judge Nelson was aware of all that I knew and would agree that I was justified in saying to him what I did. I certified in writing my confident belief that Sumter would be evacuated in five days; that no alteration would be made in the condition of affairs in the Gulf prejudicial to the Confederate States; and that a demand for an answer to his letter to the Secretary would be productive of evil. He preferred to write the letter to Mr. Davis and consented to the requisite delay.

I have informed Mr. Seward of this the same day by letter and of the communication I had made.

[When the evacuation failed to take place as Seward had indicated it would, Campbell, of course, demanded explanations. The narrative continues:] Mr. Seward said he must be particular in his intercourse with me, and that he would go to see the President. He left me in his office and was absent some minutes. When he returned, he wrote for the answer to Governor Pickens: "I am satisfied the Government will not undertake to supply Fort Sumter without giving notice to Governor Pickens." It was understood between us that the import of the conversations previously had, was not affected by what had taken place.

During the first week in April it became apparent to persons in Washington City that some important decision in regard to the questions relative to the seceding States had taken place. The troops which had been collected there were removed; rumors among naval officers of movements of vessels of war were current. There had been an unusual concourse of politicians there, and

the tone of one party became more menacing and of the other more anxious and despondent. I recollect to have heard that an expedition for the relief of Sumter had been resolved on, and also threatening speeches of President Lincoln were quoted. Mr. Crawford applied to me for a fulfillment of the pledge for the evacuation of Sumter or for explanations.

On the seventh of April I addressed Mr. Seward a letter, reciting what had taken place, the anxiety of the Commissioners, and asked explanation. I expressed to him an apprehension that a collision might arise, and suggested a remedy. My communication referred to the condition both of Sumter and Pickens. His reply: "Faithfully kept as to Sumter, wait and see; other suggestions received and will be respectfully considered." There was no signature to this note, date, etc. The address was merely on the envelope that enclosed the loose piece of paper on which it was written.

F.

DID LINCOLN DELIBERATELY PRECIPITATE WAR?

As early as 1861 a Democratic journalist made the accusation that Lincoln's acts in the Sumter crisis were an "adroit manoeuvre" to "precipitate the attack upon Sumter [*sic*] . . . for . . . its . . . effect upon the public feeling of the North." Since that time there has been recurrent controversy on the question, and elaborate arguments have been marshalled. Twentieth-century discussions on the opposing sides of this question are given below.

1. *Indictment of Lincoln.* The most able indictment of Lincoln's motives and policy is offered in an article by Charles W. Ramsdell, "Lincoln and Fort Sumter."³²

The government at Montgomery was in no hurry to force the issue, partly because it was quite well aware of the danger of assuming the aggressive and partly because it was waiting to see what its commissioners would be able to effect at Washington, where Seward was holding out hopes to them of the eventual evacuation of Sumter. At some time, while turning these things over in his mind, this daring thought must have occurred to Lincoln: Could the Southerners be *induced* to attack Sumter, to assume the aggressive and thus put themselves in the wrong in the eyes of the North and of the world? If they could, the latent irritation perceptible among the Northern moderates might flame out against the secessionists and in support of the government. The two wings of his party would unite, some at least of the Democrats would come to his support, even the border-state people might be held, if they could be convinced that the war was being forced by the secessionists.

Unless he could unite them in defense of the authority of the government, the peaceable and the "stiff-backed" Republicans would split apart, the party would collapse, his administration would be a failure, and he would go down in history as a weak man who had allowed the Union to crumble in his hands. As things now stood, the only way by which the Union could be restored, his party and his administration saved, was by an unequivocal assertion of the authority of the government, that is, through war. But he must not openly assume the aggressive; that must be done by the secessionists. The best opportunity was at Fort Sumter, but the time left was short for Anderson was running short of essential supplies. . . .

On the afternoon of April 6 Secretary Welles received a letter from Captain Henry A. Adams of the navy, stationed off Fort Pickens, explaining that he had not landed the artillery company at the fort in accordance with General Scott's order of March 12 because of controlling orders from the former Secretary of the Navy to respect the truce of February 29, but stating that he was now ready to obey if ordered to land the men. Welles consulted the President and then hurried off

Lieutenant John L. Worden with verbal orders to Captain Adams to land the men at once.

This incident gave occasion for a strange statement of Lincoln which deserves notice. In his special message to Congress of July 4, he stated that the expedition for the relief of Sumter was first prepared "to be ultimately used or not according to circumstances," and intimated that, if Pickens had been relieved in March, Sumter would have been evacuated, and that it had not been decided to use the expedition until word came that Fort Pickens had not been reinforced in accordance with the order of March 12. The strange thing about this statement is that word was not received from Adams until April 6, while positive orders had been given two days before to Captain Fox to go ahead with his expedition and at the same time Anderson had been notified to expect it. Had Lincoln become confused about the order of these events? It does not seem probable. Or was he, for effect upon public opinion, trying to strengthen the belief that his hand had been forced, that his pacific intentions had been defeated by circumstances?

[Ramsdell offers the following interpretation of Lincoln's message to the governor of South Carolina, that supplies would be sent to Sumter.]

Was the purpose of this message merely to fulfill a promise? Is there not special significance in the fact that Lincoln entrusted the form of it to no one else, but carefully drafted it himself? It is unnecessary to call attention again to the fact that Lincoln was a rare master of the written word, that he had the skill of an artist in so phrasing a sentence that it conveyed precisely the meaning he wished it to convey. He could do more than that: he could make the same sentence say one thing to one person and something entirely different to another and in each case carry the meaning he intended. It is obvious that the message to be read to Governor Pickens was intended less for that official than for General Beauregard and the Confederate government at Montgomery. But it was intended also for the people of the North and of the border states. To the suspicious and apprehensive Confederates it did not merely give information that provisions would be sent to Anderson's garrison—which should be enough to bring about an attempt to take the fort—but it carried a threat that force would be used if the provisions were not allowed to be brought in. It was a direct challenge! How were the Southerners expected to react to this challenge? To Northern readers the same words meant only that the government was taking food to hungry men to whom it was under special obligation. Northern men would see no threat; they would understand only that their government did not propose to use force if it could be avoided. Is it

possible that a man of Lincoln's known perspicacity could be blind to the different interpretations which would be placed upon his subtle words in the North and in the South? . . .

The tables were now completely turned on the Southerners. Lincoln was well out of his dilemma while they, who had heretofore had the tactical advantage of being able to wait until Anderson must evacuate, were suddenly faced with a choice of two evils. They must either take the fort before relief could arrive, thus taking the apparent offensive which they had hoped to avoid, or they must stand by quietly and see the fort provisioned.

[Ramsdell then cites statements by contemporaries which tend to show by inference that Lincoln may have sought to invite a Confederate attack. But his final and major evidence is an extract from the diary of Lincoln's friend, Senator Orville H. Browning. On July 3, 1861, Browning spent the evening with Lincoln, whom he had not seen for some months, and Lincoln told him about the Sumter crisis. According to Browning's diary,]

"He [Lincoln] told me that the very first thing placed in his hands after his inauguration was a letter from Majr Anderson announcing the impossibility of defending or relieving Sumter. That he called the cabinet together and consulted Genl Scott—that Scott concurred with Anderson, and the cabinet, with the exception of P M Genl Blair were for evacuating the Fort, and all the troubles and anxieties of his life had not equalled those which intervened between this time and the fall of Sumter. He himself conceived the idea, and proposed sending supplies, without an attempt to reinforce giving notice of the fact to Gov Pickens of S.C. The plan succeeded. They attacked Sumter—it fell, and thus, did more service than it otherwise could."

This statement [writes Professor Ramsdell] condensed from the words of Lincoln himself by a close friend who wrote them down when he returned that night to his room at "Mrs. Carter's on Capitol Hill," needs no elaboration. It completes the evidence.

2. *Defense of Lincoln.* David M. Potter argues that Lincoln did not deliberately precipitate war.³³

One wonders, of course, how correctly Browning understood Lincoln, how much interpretation he supplied, how far he distorted his information in order to conceal from himself the fact that his chief had adopted a policy which failed and had become involved in a war which he sought to avert. But despite all doubts, the Browning statement is important, and might be convincing if it did not accord so ill with all the circumstances.

Two unquestioned facts about the Sumter expedition suggest that it was not a device for initiating war under favorable terms. First, the notice to Governor Pickens, with its potentialities for spurring him to aggressive action, was not planned by Lincoln himself, but was sent to honor a pledge which had been almost wrung from Lincoln by Seward, in an effort to avert that very aggression which Lincoln is supposed to have desired. Seward, in turn, was, of all persons, least desirous of war; in fact, he clung to his objective after hope was gone, and even sent another peace agent to Richmond after the firing on Sumter. A vital part of the "plan" by which Lincoln "goaded" the South to strike first was, therefore, not his own contribution. Second, the expedition was withheld until the fort was almost starved out, and it was withheld because Lincoln still hoped that he could transfer the issue of Union to Fort Pickens before the Sumter question reached a crisis. Even beyond the point of safety, Lincoln had delayed, hoping that a display of Federal authority elsewhere would enable him to evacuate Fort Sumter.

If the assumption be made that Lincoln accepted the necessity of war, it is easy to construct an argument to show that his policy tended to initiate the war in a way favorable to him: a Confederate attack to prevent food from going to Sumter would constitute an offensive act; therefore Lincoln, wishing to force the South to take the offensive, sent food to Sumter. But assuming that Lincoln wanted to avert war, as other events in-

dicade, it will then appear that his policy offered maximum possibilities of avoiding conflict: a Confederate attack to prevent food from going to Sumter would constitute an offensive act; therefore Lincoln, wishing to save Sumter without a fight, sought to hold it by a policy so purely defensive that the South would hesitate to make an issue of it. The fact that Lincoln's policy resulted in a war does not necessarily mean that it was a war policy. . . .

Proceeding from the hypothesis that Lincoln wished to induce the South to strike, Professor Ramsdell has said that the notice to Governor Pickens "carried a threat that force would be used if the provisions were not allowed to be brought in. It was a direct challenge. . . ." If one accepts the hypothesis, the validity of this statement clearly follows. But if one assumes a different hypothesis, that Lincoln wanted peace, it is then equally valid to say that the notice to Governor Pickens carried a promise that force would not be used, if provisions were allowed to be brought in. Conclusions based on alternative assumptions, therefore, prove nothing except that Lincoln's notice to Governor Pickens promised to be advantageous to him, no matter what happened. As Professor J. G. Randall effectively states it, "To say that Lincoln meant that the first shot would be fired by the other side *if a first shot was fired*, is by no means the equivalent of saying that he deliberately maneuvered to have the shot fired. This distinction is fundamental."

XI

Interpretations of the Civil War

“**N**ow tell us what ’twas all about,”
Young Peterkin he cries;
And little Wilhelmine looks up
With wonder-waiting eyes;
“Now tell us all about the war,
And what they fought each other for.”

“It was the English,” Kaspar cried,
“Who put the French to rout;
But what they fought each other for
I could not well make out.”

ROBERT SOUTHEY, “After Blenheim”

The only war I ever approved of was the Trojan War; it was fought over a woman, and the men knew what they were fighting for.

WILLIAM LYON PHELPS

CONTENTS

Questions for Study	302
Historical Background	303
Part I: What Was the Primary Issue?	305
Part II: The Nature of the Civil War	320

QUESTIONS FOR STUDY

1. Lincoln declared to Horace Greeley that the preservation of the union was his paramount object in the prosecution of the war and that he would do about slavery whatever would be conducive to saving the union. Does this mean that Lincoln did not regard the slavery question as a basic issue in the war?
2. Alexis de Tocqueville once declared that in the ancient world the slave might easily make the transition to freedom, but that "Amongst the moderns, the abstract and transient fact of slavery is fatally united to the physical and permanent fact of color. The tradition of slavery dishonors the race, and the peculiarity of the race perpetuates the tradition of slavery." How does Edward A. Pollard's interpretation of the Civil War relate to this observation?
3. Compare Alexander H. Stephens' interpretation of the Civil War with the selection from *De Bow's Review* in Problem IX (p. 273). To what extent was a belief in the Constitutional doctrine of states' rights a factor in the secession movement?
4. In stressing the economic factors in the Civil War, what evidence do the Beards show that (1) northern political leaders were more interested in curtailing southern influence than in bettering the condition of the slave, and (2) that the coming of the war was marked by the enactment of a new economic program favorable to the forces of industry.
5. Compare the contention (p. 317) that North and South had developed diverse civilizations, with the comment in Washington's Farewell Address (p. 28) and with William H. Seward's interpretation of the union (p. 260). To what extent do you regard the "diverse civilizations" interpretation as valid?
6. Why does James G. Randall say that certain aspects of the slavery question were "at the same time trivial and tragically important"?
7. In Problem V a number of issues were presented which tended to take a sectional form, but none were of a kind which could be completely sectionalized. In the light of Craven's analysis, why did slavery become the most completely sectional of all issues? Was this process the result of inescapable forces in the situation, or was it the result of extraneous political maneuvering?
8. How does the interpretation of the Civil War by Charles Francis Adams illustrate the complete restoration of American nationalism?
9. Although the triumph of the North in the Civil War was a victory of union over disunion, the struggle was in fact a contest between opposing concepts of the union—a traditional concept and a dynamic concept. Explain.

All the preceding Problems in this volume have dealt with factors which converged in the great American crisis of 1860-61. Problem I indicated the origins in the Revolutionary period of the sense of American national feeling which sustained the unionists "in a great civil war testing whether any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure." Problem II showed how the incomplete nationalism of the early period expressed itself politically in the formation of a union which maintained a skillful balance between centralized power and localized power, corresponding to the balance that then existed in the emotions of the citizens. These were the factors of the original union.

But then new forces appeared (Problem III) which placed severe strains upon the structure as first established. The rapid growth and economic integration of the republic stimulated an increasingly robust nationalism which was infused with democratic principles that gave it added strength. Accordingly the political emphasis shifted toward a more dominant and more nearly supreme central government. This drive might have been realized easily and without friction if the economic integration had developed uniformly throughout the country, but the southern states had not advanced at the same rate or in the same direction with others in this process. Consequently they manifested a counteracting impulse to minimize the central authority and to exalt the power of the states. Thus a sectional tendency had begun to resist the aims of nationalism.

Problems IV and V presented some of the physical realities and psychological phenomena of sectionalism. They showed that points of tangible dissimilarity in the northern, western, and southern regions produced differences in economic function and in social organization and created conflicts of policy in the realm of political action; that these points of distinction and these clashes of interest could easily be magnified psychologically to create the appearance, as between North and South, of two antagonistic civilizations; but that the basic homogeneity of the American people would probably have prevented such a mental stereotype from gaining ascendancy if the slavery question had not impinged.

Slavery, however, coincided with and accentuated sectional alignments as no other issue did, thus permitting a complete sectional demarcation. Not only was it the one question which took a purely sectional form, but it was also a matter of vital significance to both sections. To the South it represented not only a basic economic element in the expanding plantation system of staple-crop agriculture but also a social adjustment to the dualism of races. To the North it represented a violation of one of the fundamental canons of American nationalism—the concept of human freedom and the equality of man. So vital did this discrepancy seem that a large part of the broad intellectual ferment appearing in the North in the early nineteenth century fixed itself upon and narrowed its attention to this one question of slavery. These factors have been presented in Problems VI and VII.

Thus far, sectionalism has been treated largely in economic, social, and intellectual terms. But all such factors usually find expression in a political form, and where antagonisms are to be worked out it is most often in the political realm. Hence Problem VIII dealt with slavery as a political question, and Problem IX with the union as a politico-constitutional question. In both these topics the essential development was the interplay of sectional urges and national loyalties. The sectional urge of the North to abolish slavery, conflicting with the national loyalty to the Constitution which protected slavery in the states, led the slavery issue to center upon the territorial question and not upon slavery itself. The sectional urge of the South to maintain at least an equilibrium with the North led it to invoke the national covenant, the Constitution of 1787, as a means of ar-

resting the further advance of northern power. When this failed and the South accepted the extreme recourse of withdrawal from the union, it justified this sectional act by a rationale which accused the North of violating the national compact and which held secession to be a Constitutional and therefore a national right. It is notable that when the South organized its own union it gave the ultimate affirmation of its loyalty to the old Constitution by adopting a virtually identical constitution for the Confederacy. Meanwhile, spokesmen of the North sought to advance the measures of their section by proving that the Constitution had created a national government with supreme powers. The actual purpose of the framers had been to establish a national government of limited powers—a nationality which would not fall to pieces under the pressure of a minority section and would not lend itself to extreme centralization under the pressure of a majority section. Both North and South, for sectional reasons, subverted the national covenant of 1787, while both claimed its sanction.

All these matters contributed to the crisis of 1860. But crisis does not always produce war; indeed it is said that some of the most important wars were those that were never fought—those in which statesmanship at the crisis averted war. Every war has its immediate as well as its background causes; therefore, Problem X presented some of the immediate steps which translated crisis into warfare in 1861.

With these topics to draw upon, certain fundamental questions should now be faced. Was there any one primary cause for the Civil War, and if so, what was it? Was there any primary responsibility for the war, and if so, where did it lie? Was there any possibility of averting the war, or was it the inevitable result of basic antagonisms? If the student does not find conclusive answers he may console himself with the thought that scholars have exhausted whole libraries with no final results. But if there are no categorical replies, at least the questions may be evaluated, the issues defined, and the possibilities limited in an approach to an answer.

THE PROBLEM

Part I.

WHAT WAS THE PRIMARY ISSUE?

Preceding Problems have already suggested many factors which contributed to the breakdown of peaceful and voluntary union, and they have also indicated some of the complicated interrelationships of these factors. Most investigators today would probably agree that no single issue can be isolated from the complex of factors among which it operated and that no single issue can be regarded as the exclusive cause of conflict. Yet almost every writer will be inclined to stress one factor more than others, and in this sense the question may be asked, "What was the primary issue?" A wide variety of theories have been advanced on this subject at one time or another, and the principal ones—both traditional and recent—are illustrated by the following selections.

A.

THE SLAVERY ISSUE

One theory which has been very widely accepted is the belief that slavery was the underlying cause of the Civil War and that the conflict was essentially one between bondage and freedom. The following selections illustrate various aspects of this view.

1. *Lincoln's Views.* Throughout his public career Abraham Lincoln had occasion to discuss the slavery question. One aspect examined was the relation of slavery to the union; another was that of slavery to the war. Perhaps his most famous pronouncement about slavery and the union was his speech at Springfield in 1858, declaring that "a house divided against itself cannot stand." In the selections below the reader will find, first, Lincoln's response at Chicago in 1858 to Douglas's criticisms of the House Divided Speech, and, second, Lincoln's comment on slavery and the war in his Second Inaugural Address, March 4, 1865.¹

[*Speech at Chicago, July 10, 1858*]

Judge Douglas makes two points upon my recent speech at Springfield. He says they are to be the issues of this campaign. The first one of these points he bases upon the language in a speech which I delivered at Springfield, which I believe I can quote correctly from memory. I said there that "we are now far into the fifth year since a policy was instituted for the avowed object and with the confident promise of putting an end to slavery agitation; under the operation of that policy, that agitation had [not?] only not ceased, but has constantly augmented. I believe it will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved,"—I am quoting

from my speech—"I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction, or its advocates will push it forward until it shall become alike lawful in all the States North as well as South."

What is the paragraph? In this paragraph which I have quoted in your hearing, and to which I ask the attention of all, Judge Douglas thinks he discovers great political heresy. I want your attention particularly to what he has inferred from it. He says I am in favor of making all the States of this Union uniform in all their internal regulations; that in all their domestic concerns I am in favor of making them entirely uniform. He draws this inference from the language I have quoted to you. He says that I am in favor of making war by the North upon the South for the extinction of slavery; that I am also in favor of inviting, as he expresses it, the South to a war upon the North for the purpose of nationalizing slavery. Now, it is singular enough, if you will carefully read that passage over, that I did not say that I was in favor of anything in it. I only said what I expected would take place. I made a prediction only—it may have been a foolish one perhaps. I did not even say that I desired that slavery should be put in course of ultimate extinction. I do say so now, however, so there need be no longer any difficulty about that. It may be written down in the next speech. . . . I know what I meant, and

I will not leave this crowd in doubt, if I can explain it to them, what I really meant in the use of that paragraph.

I am not, in the first place, unaware that this Government has endured eighty-two years, half slave and half free. I know that. I am tolerably well acquainted with the history of the country, and I know that it has endured eighty-two years, half slave and half free. I *believe*—and that is what I meant to allude to there—I *believe* it has endured because, during all that time, until the introduction of the Nebraska Bill, the public mind did rest, all the time, in the belief that slavery was in course of ultimate extinction.

[*Second Inaugural Address*]

One eighth of the whole population were colored slaves, not distributed generally over the Union, but localized in the Southern part of it. These slaves constituted a peculiar and powerful interest. All knew that this interest was, somehow, the cause of the war. To strengthen, perpetuate, and extend this interest was the object for which the insurgents would rend the Union, even by war; while the government claimed no right to do more than to restrict the territorial enlargement of it. Neither party expected for the war, the magnitude, or the duration, which it has already attained. Neither anticipated that the *cause* of the conflict might cease with, or even before, the conflict itself should cease. Each looked for an easier triumph, and a result less fundamental and astounding. Both read the same Bible, and pray to the same God; and each invokes His aid against the other. It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces; but let us judge not that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered; that of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has his own purposes. "Woe unto the world because of offences! for it must needs be that offences come; but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh!" If we shall suppose that American Slavery is one of those offences which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He gives to both North and South, this terrible war, as the woe due to those by whom the offence came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a Living God always ascribe to Him? Fondly do we hope—fervently do we pray—that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue, until all the wealth piled by the bond-man's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash, shall be paid by

another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said "the judgments of the Lord, are true and righteous altogether."

2. *Slavery the Indirect Cause.* On May 4, 1861, the Madison (Wis.) *Daily Argus and Democrat* carried an editorial which treated slavery as the principal cause of the war, but, in its discussion, suggested that it was really the conjunction of slavery with other factors which precipitated the conflict.²

Till secession had become an actual fact—till the conspiracies of thirty years had ripened into actual rebellion, and treason to the government was organized and armed—there was no party at the north that sought or desired to weaken the Constitutional guarantees that protected slavery. On the contrary, all parties recognized its legal existence, and respected the established measures for its protection. A large party at the north were favorable to even extending and fortifying such measures of safety as those directly interested in the institution deemed necessary for its perpetuity. All their demands have been complied with. Measure after measure of rigorous and obnoxious legislation had been proposed, agitated, adopted and finally acquiesced in by a great majority of the North.

And we can hardly doubt—if peace had continued, if Lincoln's election had been recognized at the south, and his administration had only met with the political opposition that its predecessors had met—his party would have been defeated at the next general election, and, in time, the last demands of slavery would have been conceded—protection in the territories and the right of transit through the states would at some time have been granted, and though imperfectly observed at first, as the fugitive slave law was, would become [*sic*] to be recognized at length as the settled policy of the nation. We regard this as probable, judging from the former course of the North on the subject, and by the fact that the great controlling commercial interests were leagued with the south, and a united south would always have a great party at the North, as they always before had to aid and sympathize with them. . . .

But with all the nourishing care of Government; with such special legislation as no government ever before yielded to any interest, slavery was constantly losing in the rivalry with free labor; the disproportion was vastly increasing with each decade; the importance of the south was dwindling, and the great southern states were falling from the first and second rank to the fifth and seventh. Northern enterprise was fast outstripping them in the race for power, and the increase of northern population was fast reducing

the southern minority. No factitious aid, and no increase of privileges and protection could change this sure and rapid progress of events.

This was foreseen in 1830 by the only really great statesman whose entire abilities and statesmanship were ever devoted to protecting the interests and existence of slavery. He saw that in the Union his great labors would be fruitless; and then CALHOUN planted the seeds of disunion.—He carefully nurtured their slow and painful growth, and taught his followers the process by which they were to be brought to maturity. Long opposed and discouraged by the patriots of the country, often subdued and conquered, they were still nourished faithfully in secret, and found many congenial soils. Secret conspiracy, the arts of demagogues, the labors of men high in power, and constant efforts to excite the Southern mind were the means by which in our day the heresies of secession have taken possession of so many States; they have revolted and taken up arms against the government. The cause of the rebellion is that the South has become satisfied of its hopeless and constantly growing inferiority to the North.

With the first gun from the rebels in arms perished every sympathy at the North with slavery. Never more, if peace were concluded tomorrow would slavery be granted another guarantee. On the contrary—those which it has possessed no longer exist; by the acts of the South itself they have been forfeited. The war cannot now end but with the total extinction of slavery, which was the cause of the war; for this is the first and must be the last armed contest between the two sections of this Union.

3. *Slavery a Direct Cause.* The most elaborate of the interpretations treating slavery as the primary cause of the Civil War is the massive three-volume *History of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America* (1872–77) by Henry Wilson. A Republican, Vice President under Grant when this work was completed, Wilson had been an ardent antislavery senator from Massachusetts before and during the war. His work therefore reflects some of the partisanship of one who was active in the contest; it reflects also a nineteenth-century tendency to interpret history in terms of absolute moral standards. Below are the opening and concluding passages.³

God's Holy Word declares that man was doomed to eat his bread in the sweat of his face. History and tradition teach that the indolent, the crafty, and the strong, unmindful of human rights, have ever sought to evade this Divine decree by filching their bread from the constrained and unpaid toil of others. From inborn indolence, conjoined

with avarice, pride, and lust of power, has sprung slavery in all its Protean forms, from the mildest type of servitude to the harsh and hopeless condition of absolute and hereditary bondage. Thus have grown and flourished caste and privilege, those deadly foes of the rights and well-being of mankind, which can exist only by despoiling the many for the benefit of the few.

American slavery reduced man, created in the Divine image, to property. It converted a being endowed with conscience, reason, affections, sympathies, and hopes, into a chattel. It sunk a free moral agent, with rational attributes and immortal aspirations, to merchandise. It made him a beast of burden in the field of toil, an outcast in social life, a cipher in the courts of law, and a pariah in the house of God. To claim himself, or to use himself for his own benefit or the benefit of wife or child, was deemed a crime. His master could dispose of his person at will, and of everything acquired by his enforced and unrequited toil.

This complete subversion of the natural rights of millions, by which they were "deemed, held, taken, reputed, and adjudged in law to be chattels personal to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever," constituted a system antagonistic to the doctrines of reason and the monitions of conscience, and developed and gratified the most intense spirit of personal pride, a love of class distinctions, and the lust of dominion. Hence arose a commanding power, ever sensitive, jealous, proscriptive, dominating, and aggressive, which was recognized and fitly characterized as the Slave Power.

This slavery and this Slave Power, in their economical, social, moral, ecclesiastical, and political relations to the people and to the government, demoralizing the one and distracting the councils of the other, made up the vital issues of that "irrepressible conflict" which finally culminated in a civil war that startled the nations by its suddenness, fierceness, and gigantic proportions." . . .

The proposed limits of this volume have been reached without taking up all the topics embraced within its original plan. . . . Slavery has been traced from its small beginnings to its overshadowing greatness,—from the few seeds planted at Jamestown in 1620 to its woeful harvest covering the land,—from being a system of labor, in bad repute and dying out, or existing by sufferance when the Constitution was framed, to its becoming an "institution," dominating the government, and exerting a commanding if not a controlling influence in society, in the church, and in the commercial world. It has been shown, too, that in the plentitude of its power, impatient of the least restraint or check, anxious to guard against

apprehended dangers arising from its local, restricted, and questionable character, it demanded new guarantees, and claimed that it should be no longer sectional but national, not only wandering everywhere at will, but everywhere protected by the aegis of the Constitution, and maintained by the arm of Federal authority. Such guarantees being too humiliating and wicked for any but the most craven to submit to, this Power appealed to arms, determined to rend what it could not rule, and break what it could not control with an unquestioned supremacy.

4. *Property Tenure or Caste Barrier?* Edward A. Pollard, an editor in Richmond, Virginia, published in 1868 a little book entitled *The Lost Cause Regained*. At that time the Confederacy had been utterly destroyed and the South lay prostrate in defeat. It was startling, therefore, to have a southern writer come forward with the belief that the South might yet gain the essential objective of the war. Pollard's discussion in one sense paralleled the interpretations which held slavery to be the primary cause of the war; in another sense it offered a revolutionary departure from these interpretations.⁴

[Pollard contends:] . . . that the true cause fought for in the late war has not been "lost" immeasurably or irrevocably, but is yet in a condition to be "regained" by the South on ultimate issues of the political contest. . . .

That the late war was much misunderstood in the South, and its true inspiration thereby lost or

diminished, through the fallacy that Slavery was defended as a property tenure, or as a peculiar institution of labour; when the true ground of defence was as of a barrier against a contention and war of races.

That the greatest value of Slavery was as such a barrier.

That the war has done nothing more than destroy this barrier, and liberate and throw upon the country the ultimate question of the Negro.

That the question of the Negro practically couples or associates a revolutionary design upon the Constitution; and that the true question which the war involved, and which it merely liberated for greater breadth of controversy was the supremacy of the white race, and along with it the preservation of the political traditions of the country.

That in contesting this cause the South is far stronger than in any former contest, and is supplied with new aids and inspirations.

That if she succeeds to the extent of securing the supremacy of the white man, and the traditional liberties of the country—in short, to the extent of defeating the Radical party—she really triumphs in the true cause of the war, with respect to all its fundamental and vital issues.

That this triumph is at the loss only of so many dollars and cents in the property tenure of Slavery—the South still retaining the Negro as a labourer, and keeping him in a condition where his *political* influence is as indifferent as when he was a slave;—and that the pecuniary loss is utterly insignificant, as the price of "the lost cause regained."

B.

THE STATES' RIGHTS ISSUE

While northern writers in the immediate postwar period tended to explain the Civil War in the fixed and absolute moral terms of the slavery issue, defenders of the South explained it in the fixed and absolute terms of states' rights, including the right of secession. This explanation stressed the argument that the majority section—the North—had subverted the original federated union of 1787 by transforming it into a powerful consolidated authority, whereupon the South seceded to protect the integrity of the states and the principle of local self-government. In this connection the student may recall Davis's and Calhoun's comment on the transformation of the original union (pp. 222, 262). One general statement and one special aspect of this interpretation are illustrated in the selections.

1. *As Alexander H. Stephens Saw It.* In the passage quoted, Stephens begins by arguing that secession was a valid act under the Constitution. He then continues: ⁵

Had this foundation principle of the system then been generally acknowledged—had no military force been called out to prevent the exercise of this right of withdrawal on the part of the seceding States—had no war been waged against

Georgia and the other States, for their assertion and maintenance of this right, had not this primary law of our entire system of Government been violated in the war so waged, I cannot permit myself to entertain the shadow of a doubt, that the whole controversy, between the States and Sections, would, at no distant day, have been satisfactorily and harmoniously adjusted, under the peaceful and beneficent operation of this very law itself. Just as all perturbations and irregulari-

ties are adjusted in the solar system, by the simple law of gravitation, from which alone it sprung in the beginning, and on which alone its continuance, with its wonderfully harmonious workings, depends!

A brief illustration will more clearly unfold this view. Had the right of withdrawal not been denied or resisted, those States, which had openly, confessedly, and avowedly disregarded their obligations, under the Compact, in the matter of the rendition of fugitives from service, and fugitives from justice, appealing as they did, to "a higher Law" than the Constitution, would have reconsidered their acts, and renewed their covenants under the bonds of Union, and the Federal administration would have abandoned its policy of taking charge of subjects not within the limits of its delegated powers. The first aberrations in the system; that is the disregard of plighted faith, which had caused the second, that is the secession movement, would themselves have been rectified by that very movement! This rectification on the one side would have been attended by a corresponding rectification on the other. This would have been a *necessary* and *inevitable* result, whatever parties, under the influence of passion at the time, may have thought of the nature and permanency of the separation. That is, it would necessarily and inevitably have been the result, if the assumption on which the Union was founded be correct, namely, that it was for the best interest of all the States to be united upon the terms set forth in the Constitution—each State faithfully performing all its obligations, and the Federal Head confining its action strictly to the subjects with which it was charged. On this point, that the Union was best for all, my own convictions were strong and thorough for many reasons, that may be given hereafter. . . .

But if, on the contrary, the whole assumption on which the Union was formed was wrong,—if it were not for the true and best interests of all the States, constituted as they were, to be so united,—if it were true, as asserted by the controlling spirits of the derelict States, that the Constitution itself as to them, was but a "covenant with death and an agreement with Hell,"—then, of course, the readjustment would not have taken place, and ought not to have taken place. But I did not believe that the masses of the people in these States entertained any such sentiments towards the work of their Fathers!

My opinion was, that it only required those masses to see, feel, and appreciate the great advantages of that Union to them; and to realize the fact that a Compact, broken by them, could not longer be binding upon others, as Mr. Webster had said, to cause them to compel their officials to comply with the terms of an engagement,

which, upon the whole, was of so great importance to their best interests. My convictions were equally strong that, when this was done, the masses of the people at the South, influenced by like considerations, would have controlled all opposition to their cheerful and cordial return to their proper places.

There would have been no war, no bloodshed, no sacking of towns and cities, no desolation, no billions of treasure expended, on either side, and no million of lives sacrificed in the unnatural and fratricidal strife; there would have been none of the present troubles about restoration, or reconstruction; but, instead of these lamentable scenes, a new spectacle of wonder would have been presented for the guide and instruction of the astonished Nations of the earth, greater than that exhibited after the Nullification pacification, of the matchless workings of our American Institutions of Self-Government by the people!

You readily perceive, therefore, how thoroughly, looking to the grand results, my entire feelings, heart, and soul, with every energy of mind and body, became enlisted in the success of this cause, when force was invoked, when war was waged to put it down. It was the cause, not only of the Seceding States, but the cause of all the States, and in this view it became, to a great extent, the cause of Constitutional Liberty everywhere. It was the cause of the Federative principle of Government, against the principle of Empire! The cause of the Grecian type of Civilization against the Asiatic! So, at least, I viewed it, with all the earnestness of the profoundest convictions.

The matter of Slavery, so-called, which was the proximate cause of these irregular movements on both sides, and which ended in the general collision of war, as we have seen, was of infinitely less importance to the Seceding States, than the recognition of this great principle.

2. *The Border States and Secession.* Stephens' discussion would leave a reader with the impression that all the seceding states seceded for the same reason and that they can therefore be treated as a group. The fact is, however, that seven of the Confederate states—those in the lower South—seceded after Lincoln's election, while four others refused to secede at that time and joined the Confederacy only after war had actually begun—and then because they were unwilling to take part in the coercion of other southern states. Clearly the position of those who seceded because of unwillingness to remain in the union is quite unlike that of those who for themselves chose union rather than secession, but who fought to defend the secession of other states. To the latter, clearly, secession

was in some degree a matter of principle; to the former it may have been merely an expedient. The distinctive nature of the involvement of these states of the upper South—Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Arkansas—is suggested by an editorial which was published in the Charlottesville (Va.) *Review*, January 4, 1861.⁶

So important do we regard the Union, so much do we cherish it, that the pulling down of its splendid columns is to us like the fall of the paternal walls and roof, and the demolition of all the most endearing emblems of home. We know that we shall never find any other such country. We know that we shall never see any other such flag. We know we shall never stand up as proudly and as exultant under any other nationality.

Therefore, with our views of the nature of the government, and with these affections towards the Union, under any ordinary circumstances, the feeling at the South in favor of resisting the impetus and intemperate action of South Carolina, would extort from us the most hearty and unqualified sympathy.

Even as the matter stands, we entertain towards South Carolina the most bitter resentment. We

feel that she has not only precipitately thrown down the bulwarks of the Union, and inaugurated on her own responsibility revolution and anarchy; but she has done so with the full knowledge—aye, the intention—to hold Virginia and the border States between her and the Storm, and to carry out her caprices, regardless of these border States, while relying on them.

But—however it has been done—an issue has been made. The subjection of South Carolina or any seceding State, in consequence of their determination not to submit to the policy of the Republicans, is a blow at the entire South—subjection to all. We are, thenceforth, humiliated. We are conquered. We could not hold up our heads in that Union any more. We would meet a Northern man as the Saxon met the Norman.

Our fellow-countrymen at the North can undertake to preserve this Union with the sword, if they shall deem it wise. They may consider South Carolina, Alabama, or Mississippi, as in a state of secession or rebellion. The naked fact is, that, at the South, upon any display of force, whether belonging to the political school of Mr. CALHOUN or Mr. WEBSTER, every sword will leap from its scabbard from the mouth of the Susquehanna to those of the Mississippi.

C.

THE UNION ISSUE

What the states' rights issue was to the South, the union issue was to the North. If to the Confederates secession was a means to protect the integrity of the states against federal consolidation, to the North it was a threat to the integrity of the union. Many people who remained indifferent to the slavery question regarded this issue of union as vital enough to justify war.

1. "*The Object of the War*," *Editorial in the Concord New Hampshire Patriot and State Gazette*, May 8, 1861.⁷

The course of a portion of the republican papers and their pulpit orators has raised a vitally important question as to the object and purpose of the war which the people of the North are now so unitedly and energetically preparing to prosecute against the rebels.—That question is this: Is this a war in support of the Government, the Constitution, the Union, and the dearly-purchased rights of a free people, or a negro crusade for the abolition of slavery? Whatever may have been the views of the people as to the causes of the war, or their opinions as to the proper remedy for the troubles out of which it has grown, there is no question that the great mass of them have responded to the summons to war with the distinct understanding that they were called upon to *preserve* national institutions and constitutional

privileges, and not to *destroy* them—to sustain and perpetuate the Constitution and the Union, to uphold the Government, and to put down armed rebellion seeking their overthrow.

If such is the real character and purpose of the war, it must and will be cordially supported and energetically aided by the united people of the North; but if it is an abolition crusade, designed to destroy the rights and institutions of the South recognized by the Constitution, then it is a wicked and treasonable war and will not be participated in by any man who loves the old Union, reveres the Constitution and has a patriot's devotion to the Government and flag of our country.

We do not doubt that the President and his constitutional advisers entered upon this great contest with a single view to maintain[ing] the integrity of the Union, the authority of the Government, the perpetuity of the Constitution, the honor, rights, welfare and glory of the country, its flag and its people; and those who now seek

to give it a different direction and purpose, have no countenance from those in authority.

2. *"The War," Editorial in the New Orleans Bee, May 1, 1861.*⁸

The more moderate of the Northern papers still persist in the preposterous assertion that the people of that section have taken up arms simply to preserve the Union. Now, in the first place, this is not true, and in the next, if it were true, it would not in the slightest degree diminish the enormity of Mr. LINCOLN'S conduct. We say it is not true that this war is waged for the maintenance of the Union. The North knows better than that. She may be cruel, intolerant, aggressive and fanatical, but she is shrewd enough to fathom motives, and sensible enough to understand the impossibility of bringing together the ruptured members of the Confederacy, and of keeping them together if they could be momentarily forced into juxtaposition. The Union is the pretext—the subjection of the South once for all to the supremacy of sectional foes is the real object of the war. Equally true is it that if the North really had at heart the perpetuity of the Union, Mr. LINCOLN'S policy has been none the less barbarous and unjustifiable. Unless he is a born idiot, which we do not believe, he must be aware that to send armies to occupy the South, and fleets to blockade her ports; to seize on all provisions and other articles destined for the South; to maltreat all who sympathize with us, and to display envenomed hostility to us by every possible manifestation, is not exactly calculated to increase the cohesive affinities between the South and North. LINCOLN, instead of remitting them, is driving in the wedge of separation with all his force. He has acted as if his real design had been to place an eternal and impassable barrier between the two sections. This has been the effect, let his views have been what they may.

3. *The Congressional War Aim.* On July 22, 1861, the House of Representatives adopted, with only two opposing votes, a resolution by John J. Crittenden of Kentucky on the origin of the war.⁹ A companion resolution in almost identical terms was passed by the Senate on July 25.

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, That the present deplorable civil war has been forced upon the country by the disunionists of the southern States now in arms against the constitutional government, and in arms around the capital; that in this national emergency, Congress, banishing all feelings of mere passion or resentment, will recollect only its duty to the whole country; that this war is not waged on our part in any spirit of

oppression, or for any purpose of overthrowing or interfering with the rights or established institutions of those States, but to defend and maintain the *supremacy* of the Constitution, and to preserve the Union with all the dignity, equality, and rights of the several States unimpaired; and that as soon as these objects are accomplished the war ought to cease.

4. *Lincoln's War Aim: Reply to Greeley.*

President Lincoln wrote a letter to Horace Greeley on August 22, 1862, in which he stated the purpose of the administration in prosecuting the war. Greeley was a prominent antislavery leader and the editor of the *New York Tribune*, most powerful of the Republican newspapers. This letter was written exactly one month before Lincoln issued his Emancipation Proclamation, but he had already started drafting such a proclamation, and on July 22 he had indicated to the cabinet that he had made up his mind to issue it at an opportune time.¹⁰

As to the policy I "seem to be pursuing," as you say, I have not meant to leave any one in doubt.

I would save the Union. I would save it the shortest way under the Constitution. The sooner the national authority can be restored; the nearer the Union will be "the Union as it was." If there be those who would not save the Union, unless they could at the same time *save* slavery, I do not agree with them. If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time *destroy* slavery, I do not agree with them. My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is *not* either to save or to destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing *any* slave I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing *all* the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone I would also do that. What I do about slavery, and the colored race, I do because I believe it helps to save the Union; and what I forbear, I forbear because I do *not* believe it would help to save the Union. I shall do *less* whenever I shall believe what I am doing hurts the cause, and I shall do *more* whenever I shall believe doing more will help the cause. I shall try to correct errors when shown to be errors; and I shall adopt new views so fast as they shall appear to be true views.

I have here stated my purpose according to my view of *official* duty; and I intend no modification of my oft-expressed *personal* wish that all men everywhere could be free.

5. *Lincoln's War Aim: Gettysburg.* The preceding selection shows how Lincoln sometimes stressed the Union as the primary issue of the war, while the selection on page 305 showed

how at other times he stressed the slavery issue. His most famous statement of the purposes for which the war was fought, however, was his address at Gettysburg on November 19, 1863. This statement deserves close study as a synthesis of Lincoln's ultimate views.¹¹

Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate—we can not consecrate—we can not hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

6. *The Union Issue in Perspective.* The importance of the union and of the Civil War as the instrument by which the union was saved is in many ways self-evident but in another sense is only gradually revealed as the long-range value of the union is revealed. For instance, the vital need of American union appears much more clearly in the light of modern fascist and communist world forces than it did for a full generation after the Civil War. Americans waited more than fifty years to see manifest this aspect of a leading war issue. In 1922 N. W. Stephenson suggested the full magnitude of the union issue.¹²

Whether we admire the result or deplore the result, is a question of the point of view. Again I insist that history is not a judicial process, but an analytical and descriptive one. What is incontestable is that the American Republic is the central fact of the present day. We are now the most powerful, we are also, probably, the most distinctive country in the world. Because we are what we are, the world during the next chapter of its history will be what it will be. If the result should prove unfortunate, then Lincoln's achievement was in the nature of a tragic victory. If the outcome should prove beneficent, then Lincoln's achievement is one of the greatest in history. But whatever the eventual result, the enormous significance is not to be questioned. The statesman who determined the course of American development, who guided the Republic past its turning-point, is one of the prime factors of modern experience. His work contributed to establishing a new balance among the social forces of his country. Out of this has resulted a new balance among the social forces of the world.

D.

THE ISSUE OF RIVAL ECONOMIES SEEKING DOMINANCE

The issues of slavery, states' rights, and the union involved moral and political factors. Until the twentieth century the great majority of critics were content to accept these factors as basic. But as the social sciences developed, increasing emphasis came to be laid upon economic and social factors as the primary forces in shaping history and in controlling the political forms and even the moral ideas of a society. Hence new explanations of the Civil War were in order. Some of the most extreme and therefore most striking of these interpretations came from Marxists, who followed their leader in his belief that all the phenomena of the capitalistic world can be interpreted largely in terms of the struggle for economic power, including power to exploit the workers. Other economic interpretations rejected the dogma of Marxism but gained valuable insight into the causes of the war by subjecting the entire sectional conflict to a broad economic analysis.

1. *An American Marxist Interpretation.* The conflict was examined briefly in 1903 in a tract written by A. M. Simons, editor of the *International Socialist Review*.¹³

By 1850 a class began to appear, national in scope, compact in organization, definite in its desires and destined soon to seize the reins of political power. This was the capitalist class; not

¹² From *Lincoln* by Nathaniel Wright Stephenson, copyright 1924. Used by special permission of the Publishers, The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

to be sure the monopolized solidified plutocracy of today, but rather the little competitive bourgeoisie that already had overthrown the feudalism of Europe. This class had now reached into the Mississippi valley and turned the currents of trade so that the political and industrial affiliations of that locality began to be with New York and New England. This class found its political expression in the Republican party.

This party naturally arose in the upper Mississippi valley where the old political ties were weakest and the new industrial interests were keenest. The people of this locality felt no such close allegiance to the recently organized states in which they lived, as did the sea-board states. Whether employers, wage workers, or small farmers they all possessed the small capitalist mind, and all hoped, and with infinitely better reason than ever since, to become capitalists. They saw in the unsettled West the opportunity to carve out new cities, locate new industries, build longer lines of railroad—in short infinite opportunity to “rise”—the highest ideal of the bourgeois mind.

The Republican party exactly corresponded to these industrial interests. It exaggerated the importance of the national government, opposed further extension of slavery and supported all measures for more rapid settlement and exploitation of the West. The first national convention of the Republican party was held at Pittsburg, February, 1856. In the address calling this convention we find the committee giving as its reasons for existence that:

“The representatives of freedom on the floors of congress have been treated with contumely, if they resist or question the right to supremacy of the slave holding class. The labor and commerce of sections where slavery does not exist obtains tardy and inadequate recognition from the general government. . . . Thus is the decision of great questions of public policy touching vast interests and vital rights made to turn, not upon the requirements of justice and honor, but upon its relation to the subject of slavery—upon the effect it will have upon the interests of the slave holding class.”

Here, and throughout this document which is intended as a justification of the formation of the Republican party, the indictment is never of slavery, but always of the South as a ruling section. There is no demand for the abolition of slavery but only for its restriction to existing limits. *The fundamental object is to obtain control of government, that capitalist interests may receive “adequate recognition.”* The platform adopted by the convention added a demand for the Pacific railroad, and an appropriation for rivers and harbors.

The vote at this election was small, but it is

significant that its greatest strength was directly along the lines of communication running from the upper Mississippi valley to the northeast Atlantic coast. Four years later, however, the Republican party placed in nomination the man, who, more than any other man, typified the best of the capitalist system,—Abraham Lincoln. The finest fruit of the Golden Age of American capitalism, he stands as the embodiment of all that is good in that system. “Rising from the people” by virtue of a fierce “struggle for existence” under frontier conditions, where that struggle was freer and fairer than anywhere else in the entire history of capitalism, he incarnates the best of the best days of capitalism. As such he must stand as the greatest American until some higher social stage shall send forth its representative.

In some respects indeed Lincoln seems to have even transcended the class from which he sprang. There were many times in which he seemed to have a glimpse of the coming conflict between capitalists and laborers and to extend his sympathy to the worker. Yet we must not expect too much of him. It has not yet been given to any man to escape from the environment which produced him; had he done so he would have been not a man but a monstrosity—a superman.

Once that the capitalist class had wrested the national government from the chattel slave holders there was nothing for them to do but to secede. The margin of profits in chattel slavery was already too narrow to permit its continuance in competition with wage slavery unless the chattel slave owners controlled the national government. The Civil war therefore was simply a contest to secure possession of the “big stick” of the national government. The northern capitalists wanted it to collect tariffs, build railroads, shoot down workers, protect trusts, and, in short, to further the interests of plutocracy. The southern chattel slave owner wanted it to secure free trade, to run down fugitive slaves, to conquer new territory for cotton fields, and to maintain the supremacy of King Cotton.

To say that the Republican party was organized, or the Civil war waged to abolish chattel slavery is but to repeat a tale invented almost a decade after the war was closed, as a means of glorifying the party of plutocracy and maintaining its supremacy. So far was the North from wishing the abolition of slavery at the opening of the Civil war that in December, 1860, after several states had already seceded, a joint resolution was passed by both houses of Congress providing for a constitutional amendment that should prohibit the adoption of any future amendment interfering with slavery within the bounds of any existing state. Neither did the South secede in order to maintain slavery. This is proven by the fact that

when the fortunes of war became desperate the Confederate cabinet proposed to abolish slavery as a means of gaining European sympathy and retaining their independent position.

2. *The Economic Interpretation.* In contrast with the preceding selection, the following one by Charles A. and Mary R. Beard does not represent a Marxian point of view, but, like the Marxian analysis, it stresses rivalry for economic power as a vital factor in causing the war.¹⁴

Had the economic systems of the North and the South remained static or changed slowly without effecting immense dislocations in the social structure, the balance of power might have been maintained indefinitely by repeating the compensatory tactics of 1787, 1820, 1833, and 1850; keeping in this manner the inherent antagonisms within the bounds of diplomacy. But nothing was stable in the economy of the United States or in the moral sentiments associated with its diversities. . . .

As the years passed, the planting leaders of Jefferson's agricultural party insisted with mounting fervor that the opposition, first of the Whigs and then of the Republicans, was at bottom an association of interests formed for the purpose of plundering productive management and labor on the land. And with steadfast insistence they declared that in the insatiable greed of their political foes lay the source of the dissensions which were tearing the country asunder.

"There is not a pursuit in which man is engaged (agriculture excepted)," exclaimed Reuben Davis of Mississippi in 1860, "which is not demanding legislative aid to enable it to enlarge its profits and all at the expense of the primary pursuit of man—agriculture. . . . Those interests, having a common purpose of plunder, have united and combined to use the government as the instrument of their operation and have thus virtually converted it into a consolidated empire. Now this combined host of interests stands arrayed against the agricultural states; and this is the reason of the conflict which like an earthquake is shaking our political fabric to its foundation." The furor over slavery is a mere subterfuge to cover other purposes. "Relentless avarice stands firm with its iron heel upon the Constitution." This creature, "incorporated avarice," has chained "the agricultural states to the northern rock" and lives like a vulture upon their prosperity. It is the effort of Prometheus to burst his manacles that provokes the assault on slavery. "These states struggle like a giant," continued Davis, "and alarm these incorporated interests, lest they may break the chain that binds them to usurpation; and therefore they are making this fierce on-

slaught upon the slave property of the southern states."

The fact that free-soil advocates waged war only on slavery in the territories was to Jefferson Davis conclusive proof of an underlying conspiracy against agriculture. He professed more respect for the abolitionist than for the free-soiler. The former, he said, is dominated by an honest conviction that slavery is wrong everywhere and that all men ought to be free; the latter does not assail slavery in the states—he merely wishes to abolish it in the territories that are in due course to be admitted to the Union.

With challenging directness, Davis turned upon his opponents in the Senate and charged them with using slavery as a blind to delude the unwary: "What do you propose, gentlemen of the Free-Soil party? Do you propose to better the condition of the slave? Not at all. What then do you propose? You say you are opposed to the expansion of slavery. . . . Is the slave to be benefited by it? Not at all. It is not humanity that influences you in the position which you now occupy before the country. . . . It is that you may have an opportunity of cheating us that you want to limit slave territory within circumscribed bounds. It is that you may have a majority in the Congress of the United States and convert the Government into an engine of northern aggrandizement. It is that your section may grow in power and prosperity upon treasures unjustly taken from the South, like the vampire bloated and gorged with the blood which it has secretly sucked from its victim. . . . You desire to weaken the political power of the southern states; and why? Because you want, by an unjust system of legislation, to promote the industry of the New England states, at the expense of the people of the South and their industry."

Such in the mind of Jefferson Davis, fated to be president of the Confederacy, was the real purpose of the party which sought to prohibit slavery in the territories; that party did not declare slavery to be a moral disease calling for the severe remedy of the surgeon; it merely sought to keep bondage out of the new states as they came into the Union—with one fundamental aim in view, namely, to gain political ascendancy in the government of the United States and fasten upon the country an economic policy that meant the exploitation of the South for the benefit of northern capitalism.

But the planters were after all fighting against the census returns, as the phrase of the day ran current. The amazing growth of northern industries, the rapid extension of railways, the swift expansion of foreign trade to the ends of the earth, the attachment of the farming regions of the West to the centers of manufacture and

finance through transportation and credit, the destruction of state consciousness by migration, the alien invasion, the erection of new commonwealths in the Valley of Democracy, the nationalistic drive of interstate commerce, the increase of population in the North, and the southward pressure of the capitalistic glacier all conspired to assure the ultimate triumph of what orators were fond of calling "the free labor system." This was a dynamic thrust far too powerful for planters operating in a limited territory with incompetent labor on soil of diminishing fertility. Those who swept forward with it, exulting in the approaching triumph of machine industry, warned the planters of their ultimate subjection. . . .

From what has just been said it must be apparent that the forces which produced the irrepressible conflict were very complex in nature and yet the momentous struggle has been so often reduced by historians to simple terms that a reëxamination of the traditional thesis has become one of the tasks of the modern age. On the part of northern writers it was long the fashion to declare that slavery was the cause of the conflict between the states. Such for example was the position taken by James Ford Rhodes and made the starting point of his monumental work.

Assuming for the moment that this assertion is correct in a general sense, it will be easily observed even on a superficial investigation that "slavery" was no simple, isolated phenomenon. In itself it was intricate and it had filaments through the whole body economic. It was a labor system, the basis of planting, and the foundation of the southern aristocracy. That aristocracy, in turn, owing to the nature of its economic operations, resorted to public policies that were opposed to capitalism, sought to dominate the federal government, and, with the help of free farmers also engaged in agriculture, did at last dominate it. In the course of that political conquest, all the plans of commerce and industry for federal protection and subvention were overborne. It took more than a finite eye to discern where slavery as an ethical question left off and economics—the struggle over the distribution of wealth—began.

On the other hand, the early historians of the southern school, chagrined by defeat and compelled to face the adverse judgment of brutal fact, made the "rights of states"—something nobler than economics or the enslavement of Negroes—the issue for which the Confederacy fought and bled. That too like slavery seems simple until subjected to a little scrutiny. What is a state? At bottom it is majority or perhaps a mere plurality of persons engaged in the quest of something supposed to be beneficial, or at all events not injurious, to the pursuers. And what are rights? Abstract, intangible moral values having neither substance

nor form? The party debates over the economic issues of the middle period answer with an emphatic negative. If the southern planters had been content to grant tariffs, bounties, subsidies, and preferences to northern commerce and industry, it is not probable that they would have been molested in their most imperious proclamations of sovereignty.

But their theories and their acts involved interests more ponderable than political rhetoric. They threatened the country with secession first in defying the tariff of abominations and when they did secede thirty years later it was in response to the victory of a tariff and homestead party that proposed nothing more dangerous to slavery itself than the mere exclusion of the institution from the territories. It took more than a finite eye to discern where their opposition to the economic system of Hamilton left off and their affection for the rights of states began. The modern reader tossed about in a contrariety of opinions can only take his bearings by examining a few indubitable realities.

With reference to the popular northern view of the conflict, there stands the stubborn fact that at no time during the long gathering of the storm did Garrison's abolition creed rise to the dignity of a first rate political issue in the North. Nobody but agitators, beneath the contempt of the towering statesmen of the age, ever dared to advocate it. No great political organization even gave it the most casual indorsement. . . .

Moreover not a single responsible statesman of the middle period committed himself to the doctrine of immediate and unconditional abolition to be achieved by independent political action. . . .

Since, therefore, the abolition of slavery never appeared in the platform of any great political party, since the only appeal ever made to the electorate on that issue was scornfully repulsed, since the spokesman of the Republicans emphatically declared that his party never intended to interfere with slavery in the states in any shape or form, it seems reasonable to assume that the institution of slavery was not the fundamental issue during the epoch preceding the bombardment of Fort Sumter.

Nor can it be truthfully said, as southern writers were fond of having it, that a tender and consistent regard for the rights of states and for a strict construction of the Constitution was the prime element in the dispute that long divided the country. As a matter of record, from the foundation of the republic, all factions were for high nationalism or low provincialism upon occasion according to their desires at the moment, according to turns in the balance of power. New England nullified federal law when her commerce was affected by the War of 1812 and came out staunchly for liberty and union, one and inseparable, now and forever,

in 1833 when South Carolina attempted to nullify a tariff act. Not long afterward, the legislature of Massachusetts, dreading the overweening strength of the Southwest, protested warmly against the annexation of Texas and resolved that "such an act of admission would have no binding force whatever on the people of Massachusetts."

Equally willing to bend theory to practical considerations, the party of the slavocracy argued that the Constitution was to be strictly and narrowly construed whenever tariff and bank measures were up for debate; but no such piddling concept of the grand document was to be held when a bill providing for the prompt and efficient return of fugitive slaves was on the carpet. Less than twenty years after South Carolina prepared to resist by arms federal officers engaged in collecting customs duties, the champions of slavery and states' rights greeted with applause a fugitive slave law which flouted the precious limitations prescribed in the first ten Amendments to the Constitution—a law which provided for the use of all the powers of the national government to assist masters in getting possession of their elusive property—which denied to the alleged slave, who might perchance be a freeman in spite of his color, the right to have a jury trial or even to testify in his own behalf. In other words, it was "constitutional" to employ the engines of the federal authority in catching slaves wherever they might be found in any northern community and to ignore utterly the elementary safeguards of liberty plainly and specifically imposed on Congress by language that admitted of no double interpretation.

On this very issue of personal liberty, historic positions on states' rights were again reversed. Following the example of South Carolina on the tariff, Wisconsin resisted the fugitive slave law as an invasion of her reserved rights—as a violation of the Constitution. Alarmed by this action, Chief Justice Taney answered the disobedient state in a ringing judicial decision announcing a high nationalism that would have delighted the heart of John Marshall, informing the recalcitrant Wisconsin that the Constitution and laws enacted under it were supreme; that the fugitive slave law was fully authorized by the Constitution; and that the Supreme Court was the final arbiter in all controversies over the respective powers of the states and the United States. . . .

While the planting class was being trampled in the dust—stripped of its wealth and political power—the capitalist class was marching onward in seven league boots. Under the feverish stimulus of war the timid army marshalled by Webster in support of the Constitution and Whig policies had been turned into a confident host, augmented in numbers by the thousands and tens of thousands who during the conflict made profits out of war

contracts and out of the rising prices of manufactured goods. At last the economic structure of machine industry towered high above agriculture—a grim monument to the fallen captain, King Cotton. Moreover, the bonds and notes of the federal government, issued in its extremity, furnished the substance for still larger business enterprise. And the beneficent government, which had carefully avoided laying drastic imposts upon profits during the war, soon afterward crowned its generosity to capitalists by abolishing the moderate tax on incomes and shifting the entire fiscal burden to goods consumed by the masses.

To measurable accumulations were added legal gains of high economic value. All that two generations of Federalists and Whigs had tried to get was won within four short years, and more besides. The tariff, which the planters had beaten down in 1857, was restored and raised to the highest point yet attained. A national banking system was established to take the place of the institution abolished in 1811 by Jeffersonian Democracy and the second institution destroyed by Jacksonian Democracy in 1836. At the same time the policy of lavish grants from the federal treasury to aid internal improvements so necessary to commerce was revived in the form of imperial gifts to railway corporations; it was in the year of emancipation that the construction of the Pacific railway, opening the overland route to the trade of the Orient, was authorized by the Congress of the United States. With similar decisiveness, the federal land question which had long vexed eastern manufacturers was duly met; the Homestead Act of 1862, innumerable grants to railways, and allotments to the states in aid of agricultural colleges provided for the disposal of the public domain. As a counter stroke, the danger of higher wages, threatened by the movement of labor to the land, was partially averted by the Immigration Act of 1864—an extraordinary law which gave federal authorization to the importation of working people under terms of contract analogous to the indentured servitude of colonial times.

While all these positive advantages were being won by capitalists in the halls of Congress, steps were taken to restrain the state legislatures which had long been the seats of agrarian unrest. By the Fourteenth Amendment, proclaiming that no state should deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, the Supreme Court at Washington was granted constitutional power to strike down any act of any state or local government menacing to "sound" business policies. Finally the crowning result of the sacrifice, the salvation of the Union, with which so many lofty sentiments were justly associated, assured to industry an immense national market surrounded by a tariff wall bidding defiance to the competition of Europe.

E.

THE ISSUE OF INCOMPATIBLE CIVILIZATIONS

The economic interpretation as rendered by most of its proponents assumes that dissimilar economic systems caused a rivalry for power, which in turn produced war. Instead, one may argue that dissimilar economic systems are important primarily because they reflect the existence of separate social systems which diverge until they are no longer compatible. The critical distinction between the economic and the social view is that one stresses the presence of active disruptive forces while the other stresses the absence of essential unifying forces. The latter view, applied to the Civil War, holds that two social systems evolved with such dissimilarities in ideals, institutions, and ways of life that they constituted separate civilizations and that union between them was artificial. This idea has been suggested previously, especially in Problem V, but it may be further illustrated by one editorial written at the time of the crisis, and by comments of two modern historians.

1. "*Are We One People?*", Editorial in the *Burlington (Vt.) Daily Times*, May 14, 1861.¹⁵

We are not a homogeneous people. We never have been so. What is distinctively denominated American civilization has streamed across the continent on parallel or nearly parallel lines, from the two centers, Plymouth Rock and Jamestown. Other elements have, from time to time, been worked in, to be sure, but they have been leavened and molded by the controlling and primary power that set the whole movement agoing. . . .

These two great currents of civilization were radically different on the start. Plymouth Rock had little sympathy with Jamestown. The plain, stern, reverent Puritan could not fraternize with the extravagant, profligate and courtly planter of the "old Dominion." These new and representative settlements were made under different circumstances with totally different aims in the settler. They took their root in entirely different ideas,—which were as widely apart in character as the two localities settled. . . .

Plymouth was always democratic—inside of the Church. Virginia was the theater of a struggle between the aristocrats and the democrats from her early settlement. The genius of Jefferson put the democrats in power for a time, but aristocracy gained the control after a while and has kept it up to to-day. The "first families" rule Virginia now. No man ever has been able to rule the sons of the Mayflower's passengers. . . .

There is no bond of sympathy between us now. As always, we have different aims and different institutions. The principles of the one are not those of the other. What is dear to the former is hateful to the latter. We started off on diverging tracks. Apparently we have kept along side by side as yoke fellows, with only a little crowding now and then, but in truth we are very far apart. There is a gap that only time can breach. One must come to the other. Massachusetts must go down to Virginia, or Virginia come up to Massachusetts.

Which shall it be? Which is toughest, most tenacious—has the most vigor and the greater power of resistance? As God reigns Virginia must come to Massachusetts, and there shall be *one people*.

2. *Dualism: Modern Writers*. Newspaper editorials of 1861 were written in heat and in the atmosphere of crisis. But a number of modern historians, with all the advantages of perspective and of dispassionate analysis, have also been impressed by the dualism of civilizations in America on the eve of the war.¹⁶

[Edward Channing, *A History of the United States*]

By the middle of the century, two distinct social organizations had developed within the United States, the one in the South and the other in the North. Southern society was based on the production of staple agricultural crops by slave labor. Northern society was bottomed on varied employments—agricultural, mechanical, and commercial—all carried on under the wage system. Two such divergent forms of society could not continue indefinitely to live side by side within the walls of one government, even within the walls of so loosely constructed a system as that of the United States under the Constitution. One or the other of these societies must perish, or both must secure complete equality, as Calhoun contended, or the two societies must separate absolutely and live each by itself under its own government. . . .

[James Truslow Adams, *The Epic of America*]

From the beginning of settlement in America, soil and climate *had* fostered a fairly sharp sectionalism of social and economic life.

It was not simply that slavery, which had been universal, had proved economically unprofitable among the Puritans and to a considerable extent in the Middle Colonies, and thus became chiefly

confined to the South. It was that, because of differences in soil and climate, a wholly different sort of life developed in the agrarian South of large plantations from that which developed in the industrial North. The South was not all made up of the Southern gentlemen of legend and of fact any more than the North was all made up of Concord sages. There were many sorts of people in both sections, but in the South they had all pretty much developed a love for a more or less easy-going country life with habits and values of its own, and disliked, even when they did not despise, the hustling, shrewd, business type of men in the North. There, on the other hand, the people looked down on the Southern type, which they could not and did not try to understand.

The slave was the working capital of the Southerner, it is true, just as cash and credit were the working capital of the Northerner, and the attack of the Abolitionists on the morality of holding slaves as property aroused as much anger in the South as a similar widespread propaganda in the South for the confiscation of Northern bank accounts would have raised in the North. But beyond that the Southerner grew increasingly resentful at having his whole way of life attacked by another section. . . .

The fact was that within our political and geographic unity we had been developing two contrasted and antagonistic types of civilization, while at the same time many and powerful factors were dictating that there must be uniformity of conditions and outlook. The railroads, telegraph, increasing mobility of population, easy transportation, interchange of goods and ideas—these and many other factors were binding the

lives of individuals closer together. What each section did and thought was of necessity more and more affecting the others. Just as we have seen that even on the individualistic frontier a uniformity of life, desires, and aspirations came to be unconsciously enforced because it spelled greater prosperity for all, so this same more or less unconscious forcing of uniformity came to be felt in national life. In two respects the North was in the line in which the world was moving, away from human "slavery," but toward the exploitation of men and women in highly industrialized communities.

The conflict between North and South, like the American Revolution, had to be rationalized. Just as we can see now that it was not any single item, like taxation without representation, which wrought the Revolution out of a situation that evolved from wholly differing attitudes toward life on the two sides of the water, so it was not simply the moral question of slavery that had been carrying North and South toward the brink of disaster for fifty years. But the whole situation had to be simplified and rationalized, as we have said, and it was characteristic of the North, and especially of New England as the centre of the rationalizing process, that the whole stress should be laid on a single issue which could be moralized. The average Northern workman cared a good deal more about the negro as a competitor than he did about him as a being in God's image who was entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. There was precious little that a negro could do in the way of pursuing happiness in most Northern communities, as Connecticut could bear witness.

F.

COMMENT ON THE FOREGOING ISSUES

The preceding sections of Part I have provided a broad cross-section of the most widely accepted beliefs as to the basic issue of the Civil War. Some of the texts have contained not only support of one specific belief but criticism of other issues. In addition to this crossfire, however, it is desirable to include a closely reasoned critique of the whole range of arguments. Such a critique has been worked out in some detail by an eminent Lincoln scholar, James G. Randall. Professor Randall has commented on the basic issues of the war in his *Civil War and Reconstruction* (1937), in his *Lincoln the President* (1945), and in several essays. A convenient summary of his interpretation is found in an article, "The Civil War Restudied."¹⁷

[On the Economic Issue]

The present writer submits that for the tragedy of the sixties the editorializing process has gone too far, or at the least that it has gone far enough, and that what is needed is more researchers and not more commentators.

An example is found in the facile assumption

that because sectional differences existed between North and South, because one section was primarily agricultural while the other was becoming primarily industrial, *ergo* (Q. E. D.) war between the sections was inevitable. On the level of hard research the writers who present this economic war-causation picture have simply not made their point. The trouble is that they "prove" too much.

They tend toward the assertion that economic factors must bring war, that differences within a nation are identical with causes of armed conflict. If one section is agricultural and the other industrial, why is that not all the more reason for union so that one section can supplement the other in a well-rounded nation?

Superficial economic determinist theory works both ways and is used for diametrically opposite effects. Sometimes the purpose is to show that economic factors bring war because a nation must be self-sufficient. This implies that a nation must have within its territory many diverse kinds of resources, both agricultural and industrial. It overlooks the broad fact of international trade and falsely assumes that only if materials are territorially owned at the point of production, and if necessary seized from another nation by war, only then can a nation enjoy use of the materials. At other times, however, the purpose in this type of theory is to show just the opposite as in the case of the Civil War, namely, that if a nation is broadly based, if it has diversity of agricultural and industrial resources, then the thing to do is to break it up and form two or more nations on a basis either of specialization or of unsound diversification which would put factories where cotton fields ought to grow.

It is needless to say that the objection here is not to economics as handmaid of history. The point to be stressed is that economic factors are tremendously various and complex, while the word "interpretation" as associated with the adjective "economic" usually suggests a broad synthesis that sees things whole and sets forth an entire situation. Merely to state the economic *aspects* of a movement is broad enough; to "interpret" the whole movement in economic terms is vastly broader. Such interpretation is necessarily imperfect if a writer takes a few economic details, much less than might be taken, and then swings his pen in broad and sweeping paragraphs. Generalization is dangerously alluring. There are times when the avoidance of a readable formula of broad interpretation requires downright force of character. When a scholar's grasp of data is not commensurate with the magnitude or the difficulties of a wide and baffling field, he should have the humility and grace to admit it. Such grace is not likely to be achieved by a writer whose dispensing of economic interpretation is in support of a pet thesis or a preconceived nostrum.

[On Slavery]

The slavery issue as a troublemaking and war-making influence requires the most careful re-study. Either of two extremes here is fundamentally misleading. To say that the slavery questions actually in dispute between the sections were

vital to the point of justifying war is one extreme. The other extreme is to write of prewar times and of the Lincoln crisis as if slavery had nothing to do with it. When one considers war causation, the extent to which the slavery issue was twisted and endlessly played up in popular discussions and political wranglings is an inescapable fact. To ignore this or to write it off is to give an inadequate mirror of the times. In two of its aspects—in respect to fugitive slaves and to territorial extension—the slavery question was at the same time trivial and tragically important. It was trivial as to interests that were in fact threatened; yet it was tragically important as a popular and political troublemaker. It may be admitted that these alleged "grievances" were not the cause of war in the sense of logically justifying resort to war; but warmaking is seldom if ever logical and it is a matter of history that the "grievances" were constant and persistent themes of intersectional bickering. Emotions may be stubborn facts however illogical they are. Antagonistic emotions were fabricated from stuff that was amazingly thin, but they existed nonetheless. . . .

On the much belabored question of slavery in the territories two things should be noted: the triviality of the question as a substantial issue, and the failure of the Republicans to apply exclusion in those territorial statutes that were actually passed in Congress early in 1861. Nor is this to ignore the seriousness of slavery. The point is not that slavery itself was a trivial matter made tragically important by overemphasis, but that this was true of those limited aspects of slavery that actually became the stuff of large controversy. Where struggle raged fundamentally against slavery itself it was not large controversy; it was rather the ardent and fanatical agitation of small antislavery groups. Large political groups simply did not try to grapple with slavery; certainly the Republican party did not do so. Rather these groups raised huge clouds of controversy out of precisely those phases of slavery that lacked substance—slavery in Kansas for instance, which never had any true bearing upon Kansas itself. They created opposition out of a highly artificial, almost a fabricated, issue. They produced quarrels out of things that would have settled themselves were it not for political agitation.

[On the Union]

There is the familiar comment that the Civil War saved the Union. This would have been said as to the secession movement of 1850 if war had occurred and the Union side had won. As to 1860, if the dilemma of war or permanent disunion embraced the whole truth, the concept is sound. If, however, preservation of the Union by

peaceable adjustment was possible, then unionists were not faced with a choice of war or disunion, but rather a choice between a Union policy of war and a Union policy in the Virginian sense of adjustment and concession.

It is impressive to recall the men who thought in 1860 that this Virginian type of Union statesmanship was possible. Among these men were James Buchanan, John Tyler, John Bell, John Floyd, John C. Breckinridge, Stephen A. Douglas, William H. Seward, Alexander H. Stephens, John J. Crittenden, Herschel V. Johnson, Benjamin H. Hill, Thurlow Weed, and many others. Most of those who thought otherwise were of the northern or southern extremist type whom historians on

both sides have set down as a minority. Confronted with the problem of whether only war could have saved the Union, historians must enter a plea of *non possumus*. They have no way of telling what might or might not have been; they will have to leave that to the columnists. But the assertion that war did save the Union is an attempt to give an answer in the guesswork field where historical answers cannot be given. The statement is untrue if it implies that a victorious Federal government used its victory in 1865 as a means of restoring the Union as it was. After Appomattox the thing that the dominant northern radicals seemed in the least hurry about was reconstruction of the Union.

Part II.

THE NATURE OF THE CIVIL WAR

The cost of the American Civil War was fearfully high, in both physical property and human life. The conflict lasted longer than any American war except the Revolution and exacted a death toll of 359,000 Union and 258,000 Confederate soldiers, out of a population of 31,400,000. This mortality seemed especially tragic in view of the fact that the war was not between peoples of alien cultures or of traditional hostility but between groups which were homogeneous in language, religion, race, political ideals and culture—groups whose forebears had joined in forming the union under the Constitution less than eighty years previously. The war was later called "The Brothers' War," and the designation was perfectly apt.

Where war occurred between groups which had so much in common and which were not on either side militaristic, historians have been much concerned with whether it could have been averted. The question has an importance far beyond the history of the 1860s, for it is connected with the vital question of the preventability of war in general. Certainly the factors making for peace in the crisis of 1861 were stronger than in many other crises, and if that conflict was "irrepressible," the implications for the world today are ominous.

The problem of the preventability of the Civil War involves the question whether the circumstances of the war were, in their nature, susceptible of control. It also involves the question whether the political leaders on either or both sides precipitated the war by defects of statesmanship or whether hostilities began because of factors which cannot be controlled by political action.

A.

THE IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT?

As to whether the war could have been averted, the trend for many years was to suppose that it could not. Consequently the phrase, "the irrepressible conflict," attained wide use among historians. This view might have continued unchallenged if World War I had not brought about a widespread interest in the attainability of peace and a widespread historical re-evaluation of the causes of modern wars. The two selections here will illustrate the earlier theory that the war was inevitable, and a later "revisionist" view, which argued that it did not at all result from inescapable forces.

1. "*The Irrepressible Conflict*." This phrase was first used in a speech by William H. Seward at Rochester, New York, on October 28, 1858. In view of the completeness with

which his analysis in this speech came to be accepted for a generation at least, it is most ironical that he had in other speeches provided a remarkably effective refutation of the

idea of a basic dualism (see p. 260) and that in his later service as Secretary of State under Lincoln he was the most persistent of all high officials in the belief that the homogeneity of the northern and southern people would make it possible to avert war.¹⁸

Our country is a theatre, which exhibits, in full operation, two radically different political systems; the one resting on the basis of servile or slave labor, the other on the basis of voluntary labor of freemen.

The laborers who are enslaved are all negroes, or persons more or less purely of African derivation. But this is only accidental. The principle of the system is, that labor in every society, by whomsoever performed, is necessarily unintellectual, groveling and base; and that the laborer, equally for his own good and for the welfare of the state, ought to be enslaved. The white laboring man, whether native or foreigner, is not enslaved, only because he cannot, as yet, be reduced to bondage.

You need not be told now that the slave system is the older of the two, and that once it was universal.

The emancipation of our own ancestors, Caucasians and Europeans as they were, hardly dates beyond a period of five hundred years. The great melioration of human society which modern times exhibit, is mainly due to the incomplete substitution of the system of voluntary labor for the old one of servile labor, which has already taken place. This African slave system is one which, in its origin and in its growth, has been altogether foreign from the habits of the races which colonized these states, and established civilization here. It was introduced on this new continent as an engine of conquest, and for the establishment of monarchical power, by the Portuguese and the Spaniards, and was rapidly extended by them all over South America, Central America, Louisiana and Mexico. Its legitimate fruits are seen in the poverty, imbecility, and anarchy, which now pervade all Portuguese and Spanish America. The free-labor system is of German extraction, and it was established in our country by emigrants from Sweden, Holland, Germany, Great Britain and Ireland.

We justly ascribe to its influences the strength, wealth, greatness, intelligence, and freedom, which the whole American people now enjoy. One of the chief elements of the value of human life is freedom in the pursuit of happiness. The slave system is not only intolerable, unjust, and inhuman, towards the laborer, whom, only because he is a laborer, it loads down with chains and converts into merchandise, but is scarcely less severe upon the freeman, to whom, only because

he is a laborer from necessity, it denies facilities for employment, and whom it expels from the community because it cannot enslave and convert him into merchandise also. It is necessarily improvident and ruinous, because, as a general truth, communities prosper and flourish or droop and decline in just the degree that they practise or neglect to practise the primary duties of justice and humanity. The free-labor system conforms to the divine law of equality, which is written in the hearts and consciences of man, and therefore is always and everywhere beneficent.

The slave system is one of constant danger, distrust, suspicion, and watchfulness. It debases those whose toil alone can produce wealth and resources for defense, to the lowest degree of which human nature is capable, to guard against mutiny and insurrection, and thus wastes energies which otherwise might be employed in national development and aggrandizement.

The free-labor system educates all alike, and by opening all the fields of industrial employment, and all the departments of authority, to the unchecked and equal rivalry of all classes of men, at once secures universal contentment, and brings into the highest possible activity all the physical, moral and social energies of the whole state. In states where the slave system prevails, the masters, directly or indirectly, secure all political power, and constitute a ruling aristocracy. In states where the free-labor system prevails, universal suffrage necessarily obtains, and the state inevitably becomes, sooner or later, a republic or democracy.

Russia yet maintains slavery, and is a despotism. Most of the other European states have abolished slavery, and adopted the system of free labor. It was the antagonistic political tendencies of the two systems which the first Napoleon was contemplating when he predicted that Europe would ultimately be either all Cossack or all republican. Never did human sagacity utter a more pregnant truth. The two systems are at once perceived to be incongruous. But they are more than incongruous—they are incompatible. They never have permanently existed together in one country, and they never can. . . .

Hitherto, the two systems have existed in different states, but side by side within the American Union. This has happened because the Union is a confederation of states. But in another aspect the United States constitute only one nation. Increase of population, which is filling the states out to their very borders, together with a new and extended net-work of railroads and other avenues, and an internal commerce which daily becomes more intimate, is rapidly bringing the states into a higher and more perfect social unity or consolidation. Thus, these antagonistic systems

are continually coming into closer contact, and collision results.

Shall I tell you what this collision means? They who think that it is accidental, unnecessary, the work of interested or fanatical agitators, and therefore ephemeral, mistake the case altogether. It is an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces, and it means that the United States must and will, sooner or later, become either entirely a slaveholding nation, or entirely a free-labor nation. Either the cotton and rice-fields of South Carolina and the sugar plantations of Louisiana will ultimately be tilled by free labor, and Charleston and New Orleans become marts for legitimate merchandise alone, or else the rye-fields and wheat-fields of Massachusetts and New York must again be surrendered by their farmers to slave culture and to the production of slaves, and Boston and New York become once more markets for trade in the bodies and souls of men. It is the failure to apprehend this great truth that induces so many unsuccessful attempts at final compromise between the slave and free states, and it is the existence of this great fact that renders all such pretended compromise, when made, vain and ephemeral.

2. *The Conflict "Repressible."* Avery O. Craven has provided an outstanding recent argument that the war might have been averted.¹⁹ The selections from James G. Randall on page 318 are also very pertinent to this question.

The move for an independent South which came to a climax in 1861 did not arise from permanent physical and social conditions. It sprang rather from temporary emotional factors cultivated both without and within the section. Men fought because they had come to fear and hate—because they had at last accepted a distorted picture of both themselves and the people in other sections.

We have found little in the natural setup of the South to make a unity out of the varied states and regions stretching from Virginia to Texas. That had to be achieved through conflict. Nor have we found inherent differences great enough to make war "inevitable" or "irrepressible" between this section and other sections within the nation. That was to be an artificial creation of inflamed minds. Around the institution of slavery was engendered most of the bitterness which made war necessary. Yet slavery in itself, as we have seen, was not an all-inclusive institution. If it had not become a symbol first of sectional differences and then of southern depravity, or superiority, according to the point of view—it might have been faced as a national question and dealt with as successfully as the South American coun-

tries dealt with the same problem. Lincoln said he was fighting to save the Union, and most certainly men of the South had been struggling for decades to save the Constitution on which that Union rested and was made possible. What we are slowly coming to realize is that war was the product, not so much of sectional differences as of emotions developed about differences, which by 1861 made it impossible longer to reason, to trust, or to compromise. Both sides believed the other to be composed of persons who could only be handled by force—fiends in human form whose lives need not be spared, whose homes could be pillaged and burned, and whose institutions must be destroyed. The North could say that it was fighting to save a Union which God had established as a great experiment in democracy and which Southerners would destroy and replace with chaos, aristocracy, and human bondage. That is the whole substance of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. The South, on the other hand, could say that it was fighting to save the original Constitution and to defend rights granted under that Constitution; that Yankees would not respect either constitutions or rights—they would even, in John Brown fashion, stir racial wars.

Higher ideals and purposes have never actuated two belligerents. Worse qualities have never been attributed to enemies. Yet when the war had been over long enough for the historian to look back without passion or prejudice, he was to discover that in saving the Union the North had really achieved a nationalism, which in turn spelled centralization in the interests of industrialism and a new dominant section; which was to make colonial provinces out of both South and West for the next generation or more; which was to crush the farmers of the nation and head them toward peasantry; and which was to create a new urban way of life which Spengler and his kind believe to be the last stage in the decline of western civilization. Workers talking of "wage slavery"; capitalists piling fortunes high while poverty and starvation stalk the streets; culture, a bought and borrowed thing, stored in museums, with intellectual sterility everywhere save in a few provincial corners! To such ends did three decades of quarreling and four years of bitter warfare make substantial contributions.

[The discussion continues with an analysis of the points at issue between the North and the South in the early period of the republic, up to 1830. It concludes that, while there was a clash between agricultural and commercial interests, this rivalry alone would never have led to the bitter sectional hostility of the period immediately preceding the Civil War.]

If this analysis be correct, then the growth of southern consciousness and the final stroke for

independent nationalism was the product of events and developments belonging in the main to the period after 1830. They had largely to do with the institution of slavery. Other issues, of course, entered into the picture, but in most cases slavery, sooner or later, managed to cast its distorting shadow over them and, ultimately, to make itself the symbol of sectional differences. The old idea of superiority and inferiority in social-economic life grew to new proportions as conflict became more bitter and the weapon of states' rights under the Constitution took on sharper edges as antagonisms developed. But the moral implications of the slavery controversy alone made hatred and distrust in degree great enough to require war.

Slavery as a reality and slavery as a symbol of southern life in its conflict with the North were, as we have seen, two quite different things. The one was important only as a very ancient labor system, probably at this time rather near the end of its existence; the other was a creation of inflamed imaginations which endowed southern men and institutions with every quality desired and extended its scope to cover all that was peculiar to the life of a section. The first was an economic fact, the other a psychological one. The first we can almost ignore in our study of sectional conflict; the second leaves few pages of history from 1830 to 1860 untouched.

For our present purposes we need only notice that in the period before 1820 slavery had been sharply criticized as a social feature by farseeing men in all sections of the nation. Northern states, finding it unprofitable and in conflict with their ideals as emphasized by the Revolution, had abolished it and southern leaders generally spoke of it as an institution which they confidently expected to pass in due season. The result was the localization of the institution, confining it to the South, and the creation of the idea that it was economically unprofitable and ethically unjustifiable. . . .

The debates over the Missouri Compromise brought the first indications that earlier attitudes were changing. They produced sharp condemnation of slavery and even the suggestion that Congress had the power to destroy it. Radicals, like Livermore of New Hampshire, asked: "How will the desire for wealth render us blind to the sin of holding both the bodies and souls of our fellow men in chains. . . . Do not, for the sake of cotton and tobacco, let it be told to future ages that, while pretending to love liberty, we have purchased an extensive country to disgrace it with the foulest reproach of nations!" Senator King of New York went so far as to insist that "no human law, compact, or compromise can establish or continue slavery. . . . There is no such thing as a slave."

Southern men, in turn, defended themselves, and a few began the partial defense of their institution. Most of them could have said with Reed of Georgia: "Believe me, sir, I am not a panegyrist of slavery. It is an unnatural state; a dark cloud which obscures half the lustre of our free institutions." All of them did agree with Barbour of Virginia who insisted that his opponent overstated its ills! "He has shaded it too deeply, with the coloring of his own imagination," he said. But a few, like William Smith of South Carolina, "justified slavery on the broadest principles, without qualification or reserve." He pronounced it "right" and viewed it "as a benefit" which would be perpetuated.

The attack on slavery as a sectional institution had been launched; the proslavery argument as a sectional defense had begun. . . .

The rise of the professional spokesmen—called "abolitionists" on the one side and "fire-eaters" on the other—needs notice only because of the emotional flavor which they added to the contest. William Lloyd Garrison had the gift for making everyone mad—including himself. He had an unusual capacity for hating. If Southerners like Dew and Harper and Ruffin were more dignified and logical, they were no less positive and one-sided. When the clergymen entered the field, and thousands of them did, they added righteous indignation to the conflict. The clan is notoriously efficient in uncompromising assertion of "right" and "wrong." When one speaks for God, argument is useless; only combat is possible.

The significant thing about the antislavery men and movements and those who developed the abstract defense of the South is the picture of slavery and of society which they created. They were too extreme for any great following. Conservative men of the day dismissed them as fanatics and hastened to assure their friends in other sections that such voices did not represent the true opinions and feelings of their people. But these fanatics, unrestrained by fact, were creating clear-cut pictures of slavery, slaves, slaveholders, and southern and northern life positive enough to suit the needs of those engaged in conflict. When politicians became enraged in debate, when the sections became entangled in strife, then these pictures were to serve wider purposes. The time would come when opponents needed just such distorted weapons—when false propaganda could take the place of truth. Then the conceptions of men and societies woven by these intense emotional voices of heaven would pass as sober truth. Enemies would become devils; friends, the incarnation of right and justice. Blood would have to be spilled.

The antislavery impulse as directed against that institution in the South began in the 1820's and

lasted until emancipation and victory in battle brought it to an end. It passed through several distinct stages, the earlier ones being more or less pure social reform in character and the later ones so badly mixed with politics that it is difficult to tell what is political, what social, and what moral. . . .

But regardless of time and place, type of anti-slavery men or form of appeal, two great facts were being impressed upon the northern people: first, the Southerner was an aristocrat, an enemy of democracy in society and government; and second, he was a man of violent and generally uncontrolled passions which led him into intemperance, licentiousness, brutality, and disregard of others' rights. Most Southerners were supposed to be slaveholders and, as such, they constituted a single interest, which could be designated as *The Slave Power*, whose purpose was the rule or the ruin of the whole Union. As the *Philanthropist* said in 1840: "All the great changes of policy which have successfully involved in disaster each and every northern interest have been introduced by the dictation of the Slave Power."

In the widely read pamphlet entitled *American Slavery As It Is*, a writer spoke of the "savage ferocity" of southern men as "the natural result of their habit of daily plundering and oppressing the slave." He tells of perpetual idleness broken only by brutal cockfights, gander pullings, and horse races so barbarous in character that "the blood of the tortured animal drips from the lash and flies at every leap from the stroke of the rowel." *Anti-Slavery Tract Number 7* declared that "a million and a half of slave women, some of them without even the tinge of African blood, are given up, a lawful prey to the unbridled lusts of their master." Theodore Parker supplied the comment on this text by saying: "The South is full of mulattoes; its best 'blood flows in the veins of slaves.' . . . Girls, the children of mulattoes, are sold at great prices, as food for private licentiousness, or public furniture in houses of ill-fame." The *Liberator* referred to Southerners as "sagacious desperadoes and remorseless men-stealers"; and the section as "ferocious and despotic." Garrison insisted that it was as easy to "transform wolves and hyenas into lambs and doves" as to appeal to southern "understandings, consciences and hearts." He topped it all by saying: "We would sooner trust the honor of the country . . . in the hands of inmates of our penitentiaries and prisons than in their hands. . . . They are the meanest thieves and the worst of robbers. . . . We do not acknowledge them to be within the pale of Christianity, of republicanism, of humanity." . . .

The final logical conclusion of all this dis-

cussion was stated by Theodore Parker in 1851 when he declared that:

"The South, in the main, had a very different origin from the North. I think few if any persons settled there for religion's sake; or for the sake of the freedom of the State. It was not a moral idea which sent men to Virginia, Georgia, or Carolina. 'Men do not gather grapes of thorns.' The difference in the seed will appear in the difference of the crop. In the character of the people of the North, and South, it appears at this day. . . . Here, now, is the great cause of the difference in the material results, represented in towns and villages, by farms and factories, ships and shops. Here is the cause of differences in the schools and colleges, churches, and in the literature; the cause of difference in men. The South with its despotic idea, dishonors labor, but wishes to compromise between its idleness and its appetite, and so kidnaps men to do its work."

"Two opposing civilizations are in conflict here, and have been from the infancy of our Union," said Professor Austin Phelps of Andover Theological Seminary. . . .

For a generation southern men and women lived under such an attack. It began, as we have said, as a simple questioning of the justice of human slavery by a few earnest, if fanatical, humanitarians. It ended on the level of a high moral crusade, the justice of which few northern men questioned, and tended to include in its sweep of purpose the overthrow of the whole southern way of life. Garrison and Phillips and Parker became as well known in the South as in the North. In fact, one writer has recently evaluated Garrison in the antislavery impulse as more important for the hatred he stirred below Mason and Dixon's line than for the influence he wielded above it. Gradually the South became conscious and bitter. It turned in self-defense. A "refutation of the calumnies circulated against" the section appeared almost as soon as the attack was begun. It showed that emotions had been stirred and revealed the possibility of a sectional response. Edwin Holland asked his neighbors to present facts in refutation of charges made, and referred to the "abundant testimony of the hostile and unfriendly spirit with which the most vital interests" of the South were discussed. . . .

By 1854 the *Macon Georgia Telegraph* could say that "the grand question . . . is what shall be done to protect the South from this everlasting enmity and turmoil, which tears the country to pieces." . . .

What stands out in all this is the belief in the peculiar quality and character of the South; the growing emotion involved in attack and defense; the assumption of differences inherent and persistent. There was a North, and there was a

South. They represented entirely different values and qualities. They were by nature enemies. And, what is most significant, *moral* values were involved—things affecting humanity, civilization, God's purposes in this world. Those are things for which men give their lives; for which holy wars are fought. National consciousness is woven from fear and resentment as well as from conviction and faith. Material realities shrink into insignificance when brought into comparison. . . .

After 1840 few issues were allowed to stand on their own merits. Individuals and groups, consciously and unconsciously, used slavery to aid their interests. John C. Calhoun and John Quincy Adams, seeking political advantage, tangled slavery hopelessly with the western demand for the annexation of Texas. David Wilmot introduced his trouble-making Proviso as part of a political game which he and his friends were playing. The repeal clause in the Kansas-Nebraska Act was the afterthought of a mere handful of politicians and not a move in response to southern demands. The Appeal to Independent Democrats, which Chase and his group used to stir the Northwest, was false in its assertions and unfair in its purposes, but it was politically effective. The damaging section in the Dred Scott decision was an *obiter dictum*, forced, according to the late Professor Hodder, by the political ambitions of dissenting judges. John Brown, who reduced rabid talk to action, is frankly considered insane by his most able biographer.

Yet these uncalled-for moves and this irresponsible leadership were the very things which lifted the crusade of a band of "crack-pot reformers" in the North and an extravagant group of "fire-eaters" in the South to the proportions of a national conflict adjustable only by civil war. Texas and slavery combined begot the Wilmot Proviso, which, in turn, forced the crisis of 1850. The repeal of the Missouri Compromise begot the Republican party and ultimately the combination of a political party and a moral crusade. The Dred Scott *obiter dictum* justified the continuation of that party as a perpetual guard against the aggressions of the South. John Brown brought the race question to the fore and added the final emotional appeal needed to pound the divergent classes of the South into a working unity.

The politician thus gave an air of reality to the abstractions of those who had evolved the slavery question into a struggle of civilizations. In his hands the conflict between freedom and slavery became a sectional contest for lands, internal improvements, tariffs, and new areas for expansion. The continuation of material well-being and the existence of fundamental rights were linked with the spread or the restriction of the "peculiar institution." An emotional fervor and moral force, which only slavery could create, was thus thrown about a whole set of very practical and concrete problems. Two ways of life and two opposing sets of constitutional principles were thus forced into an irrepressible contest for supremacy.

Yet, as a matter of fact, few actual gains or losses were involved. Texas would have come along about as it did if slavery had never been mentioned. There were only three slaves in Kansas in 1860, and there never was the slightest chance of slavery's entering Kansas or Nebraska. All well-informed men knew that by 1857, and many were saying so at the very time Lincoln was making political capital out of proslavery danger. A dozen *obiter dicta* would not have spread slavery over the North, and a hundred John Browns could not have produced a general revolution among the slaves.

The combined efforts of reformer and politician gradually created the notion of the "Slave Power" and of "Black Republicanism." Each of these creations was supposed to consist of a well-organized force and program. The one was determined to spread slavery throughout the land. The other was determined to wipe out the institution of slavery even at the cost of a race war. Both were fictions. Yet partisans were able to bring all the fears and apprehensions, all the noble purposes and sentiments aroused by the antislavery and the proslavery crusades to their side and to pour all the bitter distortions of that conflict upon their opponents. They made a conscious North and a conscious South. Each could fight for God against the Devil and his human allies. One would struggle for Union and democracy; the other for self-rule and the Constitution untarnished. Sane men on both sides, and they constituted a majority even in 1861, were helpless before fanatics armed with such holy weapons.

B.

WHO WAS RIGHT? WHO WAS WRONG?

If the Civil War be regarded as genuinely and completely the result of inevitable forces, then it would seem unnecessary to attribute blame or guilt to any person or group. Nevertheless, it was natural where war was involved for each side to assert the guilt of the other. So, for a generation after the war, Confederates were stigmatized as traitors, false to the

American flag, while the union leaders were regarded in the South as men who had waged a ruthless war of subjugation in denial of the right of self-government.

In due time a broader American nationalism began to assert itself and one of its first manifestations was a tendency to recognize that there had been sincerity, idealistic motives, and admirable qualities on both sides. As this viewpoint gained acceptance Lincoln became enshrined as a true national hero, honored in the South as well as the North, and Lee and Jackson were portrayed on postage stamps of the government against which they had fought.

This nationalistic praise of both sides was in some ways as indiscriminate as the former sectionalistic blame by each side of the other. Where partisans had at first refused to recognize that both secessionists and unionists had arrived at their opposite positions with equally sincere conviction and had defended them with equal unselfishness and courage, nationalists now recognized only sincerity and courage and refused to see that these qualities had not prevented men from adopting at times unwise and blundering courses infinitely harmful to their fellows. These successive reactions in the evaluation of the great national crisis are illustrated by a speech of Charles Francis Adams in 1902 and by a comment on this speech from the pen of Gerald W. Johnson in 1933. A final quotation from James Russell Lowell shows what American nationalists of the war period felt they had gained by the conflict.

1. *Both Sections Exonerated.* Charles Francis Adams, grandson of the President and antislavery leader, John Quincy Adams, son of the United States minister to Great Britain during the Civil War, had himself been an officer in the Union army. In 1902, being invited to make a speech at Charleston, South Carolina, he chose to discuss "The Ethics of Secession." Clearly this was a delicate subject for a Union veteran to examine in the city which, forty-one years previously, had been the birthplace of secession.²⁰

Not long since, circumstances led me into a dispassionate reëxamination of the great issues over which the country divided in the mid-years of the last century. As a result thereof, I said in a certain Phi Beta Kappa Society address delivered in June [1902], at Chicago,—“legally and technically,—not morally, again let me say, and wholly irrespective of humanitarian considerations,—to which side did the weight of argument incline during the great debate which culminated in our Civil War? . . . If we accept the judgment of some of the more modern students and investigators of history,—either wholly unprejudiced or with a distinct Union bias,—it would seem as if the weight of argument falls into what I will term the Confederate scale.” For instance, Goldwin Smith,—an Englishman, a life-long student of history, a friend and advocate of the Union during the Civil War, the author of one of the most compact and readable narratives of our national life,—Dr. Smith has recently said: “Few who have looked into the history can doubt that the Union originally was, and was generally taken by the parties to it to be, a compact, dissoluble, perhaps, most of them would have said, at pleasure, dissoluble certainly on breach of the

articles of Union.” To a like effect, but in terms even stronger, Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, now a senator from Massachusetts, has said, not in a political utterance, but in a work of historical character: “When the Constitution was adopted by the votes of States at Philadelphia, and accepted by the votes of States in popular conventions, it is safe to say that there was not a man in the country, from Washington and Hamilton, on the one side, to George Clinton and George Mason, on the other, who regarded the new system as anything but an experiment entered upon by the States, and from which each and every State had the right peaceably to withdraw, a right which was very likely to be exercised.” Incited by those utterances to yet further inquiry of my own, the result thereof was, to me at least, curious;—and moreover suggestive of moralizing.

The question is now one purely historic; but on that question of the weight of authority and argument as respects the right of secession, I found a divergence of opinion existing today so great as hardly to admit of reconciliation. On the one side it was—I am told still is—taught as an article of political faith, that not only was the constitutional right of peaceable secession at will plain, manifest and expressly reserved, but that, until a comparatively recent period, it had never been even disputed. In the words of one writer of authority, “Through a period of many years, the right of secession was not seriously questioned in any quarter except under the exigencies of party politics.” On the other hand, in the section of the country where my lot has been cast, this alleged heresy is sternly denounced, and those propounding it are challenged to their proofs. With equal positiveness it is claimed that, from the time of the adoption of the Constitution down to a comparatively recent day, “there was not a

man in the country who thought or claimed that the new system was anything but a perpetual Union."

Which contention, I asked, is right? And separating myself from my present environment, I tried to go back to the past, and to see things, not as they now are, but as they were; as they appeared to those of three generations gone,—to the fathers, in short, of our grandfathers. It was a groping after forgotten facts and conditions in places dark and unfamiliar. The results reached also, were, I confess, very open to question. But, while more or less curious as well as unexpected, they were such as a Massachusetts man, forty years ago at this time in arms for the Union, need not hesitate to set forth in South Carolina, where the right of secession, no longer proclaimed as a theory, was first resorted to as a fact.

It was Alexander Pope, hard on two centuries ago (1733) who wrote:—

"Manners with fortunes, humors turn with climes,
Tenets with books, and principles with times." . . .

As I delved into the record, I concluded that humors turned quite as much with climes in the nineteenth century as they did in the eighteenth; and that, in the later as in the earlier period, "principles," so called, bore a very close relation to "times." We, too, had been "puppets" moved by "an unseen hand at a game." As, in short, I pursued my inquiries, the individual became more and more minimized; chance and predestination cut larger figures; and, at last, it all assumed the form of a great fatalistic process, from which the unexpected alone was sure to result.

But to come to the record: For more than a century, lawyers, jurists and publicists—journalists, politicians and statesmen—have been arguing over the Federal Constitution. Sovereignty carries with it allegiance. Wherein rested sovereignty? Was it in the State or in the Nation? Was the United States a unit,—an indissoluble Union of indestructible States,—or was it a mere confederacy of nations, held together solely by a compact, upon possible infringements of which each one, so far as it was concerned, was a final judge? Each postulate has been maintained from the beginning; for that matter, is maintained still. Each has been argued out with great legal acumen and much metaphysical skill to results wholly satisfactory to those that way inclined; and yet absolutely illogical and absurd to the faithful of the other side. It was the old case of the shield of the silver and golden sides. That the two sides were irreconcilable made no difference. Be it silver or gold, the thing to him who had eyes to see was in his sight silver or gold, as the case might be. And yet, as I pursued my inquiries, I gradually felt assured, not that the thing was in this case either silver or

gold, but that it was both silver and gold. Everybody, in short, was right; no one, wrong. Merely conditions changed; and, with them, not only appearances but principles, and even facts. Simply, the inevitable, and yet the unexpected, had occurred.

2. *Both Sections Blamed.* Gerald W. Johnson challenges the contention that everyone was right and no one was wrong.²¹

Secession cost the lives of 549,543 Americans. These are the dead who were counted, but it is known that the lists, especially on the Confederate side, are not complete. The actual price of this particular political error was greater, perhaps much greater.

Yet as late as the year 1902, thirty-seven years after the fighting ended, one who had borne a creditable part in it was capable of saying, after a new examination of the records, "Everybody, in short, was right; no one wrong." We are invited to believe that 549,543 men died as a result of everybody's being right. If this is the result of righteousness, we can only wish that our forefathers had been rather more villainous. . . .

This, then, is the tale of how the Union was rent; but the narrative fails to answer the all-important question, why was it rent?

A library of respectable proportions would be required to hold all the books, pamphlets and other documents that have been written to answer that question. The greater part of these answers may be dismissed at once, because they are not true inquiries, but arguments attempting to establish the righteousness of one side or the other. This is true especially as regards those written prior to and during the conflict, and immediately thereafter. . . .

Immediately after the end of the slaughter the wounds of both sides were too painful and feverish to permit unemotional examination of the facts. Not until the Civil War was some decades in the past did the vision of American historians become sufficiently free of dust and blood for them to see much beyond the ends of their noses; but by the end of the century we began to get estimates based on scientific method rather than on tradition or emotional fixation, and the work of the historians in this field has constantly improved.

But as the record has been developed with greater and greater accuracy, it has become more and more complex. The idea, long prevalent in the North, that the Civil War was a rebellion of slave-owners determined to protect their property rights in human beings against the efforts of a humane and enlightened government to achieve emancipation, is no longer cherished, except by the illiterate. The equally nonsensical idea, equally prevalent in the South, that the Civil War was the

result of a conspiracy on the part of inferior and envious Northerners, determined to destroy a civilization they could not match and whose superiority was a standing reproach to them, has been pretty completely relegated to the war museums along with the Confederate battle-flags.

But if these simple old ideas have been abolished, their place has been taken by a very large number of infinitely complicated substitutes. The economic motive has come prominently to the fore. It is easy to see, now, how the industrialism of the North, allowed to run unchecked, must have stifled and crushed the agrarianism of the South. The social motive in various manifestations other than that of slavery has come to the fore: "The pride of caste secreted by a feudal order was simply inappropriate to an industrial régime founded on applied science." The religious motive has come to the fore. The resounding battles of the holy men, preposterous as they seem in retrospect, unquestionably did fan the flames. Innumerable other forces, all tending to the same end, have been traced, analyzed, dissected, weighed, measured and given their due place in the movement. Seward, standing in the midst of the march of events, glimpsed something of its complexity and extent and was moved to predict "the irrepressible conflict." And half a century later Adams, who had once believed happily that the whole thing was a crusade in behalf of the Negro, when his studies had revealed to him even more than Seward was able to see, exclaimed, "It all assumed the form of a great, fatalistic process, from which the unexpected alone was sure to result. . . . Simply the inevitable, and yet the unexpected, had occurred."

But this fatalistic theory grows more and more unsatisfactory to modern writers. As one of the most recent students of the subject has observed, "That idea implies that the American people were incapable of solving a difficult problem except by bloodletting, and confuses the designs of party politicians with the arts of statesmanship." It implies more than that. If the Civil War was an "irrepressible" conflict, if it was "a great, fatalistic process" and "inevitable," then as much may be said of half a dozen other conflicts which are still in prospect.

For of all the issues that combined to precipitate the conflict of the sixties one, and only one, slavery, may be said to be definitely settled. Even today industrialism presses agrarianism against the wall. Even today there are clashes between varying cultures in the United States, as there must always be in a country continental in its physical extent. Even today the interests, economic, social and cultural, of various sections are not merely divergent, but frequently diametrically opposed to each other. Americans, even today, suffer under an

Egyptian plague of merchants of hate, whose trade is to set brother against brother whenever and wherever they can. Even today there is a full quota of frenetic holy men whose practical acquaintance with the Bible seems to be limited to that terrific pronouncement, "Think not I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword." Even today does a conflict approach as savage and probably far bloodier than the one waged between 1860 and 1865? If the Civil War was really irrepressible and inevitable, without doubt there are other wars to come, for many of the same urges to conflict still exist. But if it was inevitable only in the sense that some such tragedy is the inevitable outcome of accepting idiotic leadership, then there is a possibility of avoiding a repetition of the butchery. And if there is a way out, then it becomes at least theoretically profitable for this generation to give some study to Secession. For while we may not be able to contend with destiny, surely we are able to contend with idiocy in high places.

It is a human and, in some sense, admirable, trait that has made historians balk at drawing the plainest inferences from the chronicle of the events of the sixties. In the first place, a tremendous emotional complex has been built up, including the erection of some very powerful taboos. Once committed to the arbitrament of the sword, each side promptly set about justifying itself. The warrior virtues of the men in arms were used to sanctify the statesmanship of the men who precipitated the war, and any suggestion that they fought in a worthless cause has been resented as bitterly as if it were a reflection on the men who fought. The ruin and woe worked by the Civil War were so extensive that the stricken nation for many years was simply unable to bear the thought that it was all useless, all avoidable.

In the second place, since the breakdown of the traditional contentions of the partisans, the work of examining this period of American history has been almost entirely on the side of analysis because there was a tremendous amount of analyzing to be done. Still, a certain amount of attention to synthesis is now plainly desirable, for all that analysis has shown us, so far, is that the great majority of the forces that combined to bring about the Civil War are still in operation and still potent to bring about another war. The question of largest importance to this generation is not one of the composition and number of the forces, but the process by which they were released from control.

This process is easy to define, but its explanation involves some of the deepest of psychological and social mysteries.

What happened, in brief, was that the North and the South contrived to effect an unnatural

and vicious cleavage between the law and the prophets. The South had the law and the North the prophets.

That is to say, the weight of history was with the South, the trend of events with the North. The past was with the South, the future with the North, the fathers with the South, the children with the North. And a nation that cannot contrive to make the present a link, rather than a solution of continuity, between its past and its future is a nation in peril. . . .

Calhoun, insisting upon the letter of the law, and disdainfully ignoring the spirit of the times, and Sumner, insisting upon the spirit of the times and disdainfully ignoring the plain provisions of the law, alike failed to discharge the highest duty of statesmanship, which is to reconcile the letter of the law with the spirit of the times. We have a name for a man who persistently serves a special interest to the detriment of the State; we say he is a politician, not a statesman. Because the special interests that Calhoun and Sumner served were not personal interests, and because they were men of dignity and integrity, we are accustomed to regard them as distinct from politicians as a class. But a man in public life must be judged by what he actually achieves, not by what he wishes to achieve; and the work of these men helped bring upon their country a terrific war. Morally, intellectually, spiritually, they may have been great; but as statesmen they were colossal failures.

3. *The War and American Nationalism.*

Johnson's analysis of what he regards as the folly of the Civil War generation is written in a spirit hostile to emotionalism and skeptical of idealistic values. The student may perhaps feel that his view offers the soundest approach. But in this series of Problems, dealing with the growth and vicissitudes of American nationalism, it is well to recognize that the Civil War, despite all its dreadful aspects, marked the ultimate fulfilment of the nationalistic impulse and that those who held the nationalist faith could regard the war as a terrible but at the same time a purifying ordeal—a necessary tempering of the American spirit in the furnace of war. The character of twentieth-century warfare makes it almost impossible to believe that anyone could ever have regarded war as a blessing. The fact that so fierce a contest as the Civil War could be regarded in this way is perhaps the most striking proof that American nationalism, starting from limited and imperfect beginnings at the end of the eighteenth century, had advanced to full maturity by 1865 and has formed the unchallenged basis

of American political power from that time to the present. For this concept of the Civil War as a climactic factor in the development of American nationalism, one finds a forcible illustration in an essay by James Russell Lowell in 1865 on "Reconstruction."²²

If we have not hitherto had that conscious feeling of nationality, the ideal abstract of history and tradition, which belongs to older countries, compacted by frequent war and united by memories of common danger and common triumph, it has been simply because our national existence has never been in such peril as to force upon us the conviction that it was both the title-deed of our greatness and its only safeguard. But what splendid possibilities has not our trial revealed even to ourselves! What costly stuff whereof to make a nation! Here at last is a state whose life is not narrowly concentrated in a despot or a class, but feels itself in every limb; a government which is not a mere application of force from without, but dwells as a vital principle in the will of every citizen. . . . America lay asleep, like the princess of the fairy tale, enchanted by prosperity; but at the first fiery kiss of war the spell is broken, the blood tingles along her veins again, and she awakes conscious of her beauty and her sovereignty.

It is true that, by the side of the self-devotion and public spirit, the vices and meannesses of troubled times have shown themselves, as they will and must. We have had shoddy, we have had contracts, we have had substitute-brokerage, we have had speculators in patriotism, and, still worse, in military notoriety. Men have striven to make the blood of our martyrs the seed of wealth or office. But in times of public and universal extremity, when habitual standards of action no longer serve, and ordinary currents of thought are swamped in the flood of enthusiasm or excitement, it always happens that the evil passions of some men are stimulated by what serves only to exalt the nobler qualities of others. In such epochs, evil as well as good is exaggerated. A great social convulsion shakes up the lees which underlie society, forgotten because quiescent, and the stimulus of calamity brings out the extremes of human nature, whether for good or evil.

What is especially instructive in the events we have been witnessing for the past four years is the fact that the people have been the chief actors in the drama. They have not been the led, but the leaders. They have not been involved in war by the passions or interests of their rulers, but deliberately accepted the ordeal of battle in defence of institutions which were the work of their own hands, and of whose beneficence experience had satisfied them. Loyalty has hitherto been a sentiment rather than a virtue; it has been more

often a superstition or a prejudice than a conviction of the conscience or of the understanding. Now for the first time it is identical with patriotism, and has its seat in the brain, and not the blood. It has before been picturesque, devoted, beautiful, as forgetfulness of self always is, but now it is something more than all these,—it is

logical. Here we have testimony that cannot be gainsaid to the universal vitality and intelligence which our system diffuses with healthy pulse through all its members. Every man feels himself a part, and not a subject, of the government, and can say in a truer and higher sense than Louis XIV, "I am the state."

XII

The Political Status of the Negro after Appomattox—An Issue between the Nation and the Section

THIS is a white man's government, and intended for white men only.

BENJAMIN F. PERRY
Governor of South Carolina, 1865

This is Man's Government, the Government of all men alike.

THADDEUS STEVENS
Republican Congressman, 1865

CONTENTS

Questions for Study	332
Historical Background	333
Part I: The Issue of Negro Suffrage	336
Part II: The Defeat of the Radical Program	344

QUESTIONS FOR STUDY

1. What four theories on the function of the suffrage can be found in the statements of Charles Sumner and Carl Schurz?
2. Do the motives that caused Thaddeus Stevens to support Negro suffrage raise doubts as to the influence of democratic idealism on the Radical program? Did the views of Sumner and Schurz have real significance for Republican policy?
3. What criterion does Governor Humphreys consider basic in judging the worth of a state government?
4. It may be argued that there was justification not only for the demand of the Douglass delegation that suffrage be granted the black but also for President Johnson's fears if the franchise was extended to include the ex-slave. Explain.
5. Some whites were opposed to Negro suffrage, who could not conceivably be accused of prejudice against the black. Explain.
6. The statements of Douglass, Stevens, and DuBois in Part II focus attention on the weaknesses of the Radical program. Discuss these limitations in the light of (1) the nature of American society after Appomattox, (2) Abolitionist and Radical opinion on the Negro's nature, (3) the limited role of government in the life of the individual, (4) the preference for a program of purely political aid.
7. Traditional concepts of property and the dominant position of business elements in post-Civil War America made it unlikely that Stevens's program would ever have received serious consideration. Comment.
8. Stevens claimed that his land-distribution proposal offered benefits both to the individual and to society. Explain.
9. Why have historians who considered the restoration of the union the primary purpose of Reconstruction believed that Lincoln would have been a successful President in the years after Appomattox?
10. What was Lincoln's 1865 program for the Negro? How had it changed since his Illinois days? Was it constructive? In answering the last question use the statements not only of Ficklen but also of DuBois, Stevens, and Douglass.
11. Why did the *Nation* think that the South would cease to exist as an entity? Has its prediction proved true?
12. After Appomattox northerners began to feel that they had a common future with white southerners. How did human qualities, economic desires, and political programs contribute to this feeling?
13. What did northerners come gradually to believe should be the position of the Negro in American society?

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Democratic ideas have been an important element of American nationalism since 1776. In proclaiming to the world their independence, the colonists stated the principle that all men are created free and equal. Both during and after the Revolution nationalists asserted that the American people were exceptional because they had replaced aristocratic customs with free institutions. It was easy then to reason that other areas and races should benefit from this uniqueness, and we have seen that when the United States sought expansion to north, west, and south there were frequent statements about extending the blessings of republicanism. As decades passed and the country prospered, it became possible for Americans to say that the government was no longer merely an experiment but a demonstrated success. That is, the country now had a democratic tradition.

This tradition, was invoked by the Abolitionists and also by Abraham Lincoln. The former said that they were fulfilling a principle which the Founding Fathers had stated in the Declaration of Independence but had not completely realized. And did not Lincoln reply to Douglas that the same Declaration was his "ancient faith"? The Gettysburg Address is, of course, the classic fusion of democratic and national ideals, Lincoln concluding with those well-known words, "that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Unfortunately the concept of democracy was also a source of conflict, for the word had a wide range of meanings. To some it was a political mechanism; to others it symbolized a complete way of life. In the beginning all Americans had believed that a weak central government was the essence of the term. Plainly this idea had originated in the events after 1763 when England had attempted a strengthening of the imperial ties binding colony and mother country. The feeling for local control found a strong focus in the newly formed states, and all know that the central political problem of the 1780s was the establishment of a government which Americans could feel was effective nationally yet did not seem to threaten their dearly won liberties. During the nineteenth century the section rather than the state was held to be the chief defender of local interests. Confronted with an expanding and powerful North, the South conceived itself as maintaining local rights against a tyrannical majority. Constitutional doctrine and political opposition were the familiar weapons—ultimately, withdrawal from the union. The South viewed this last action as perpetuating the tradition of '76 when a group of colonies severed their relations with the British Empire. Paradoxically, Calhoun as chief southern spokesman had been disavowing other elements in the Revolutionary heritage which northerners were coming increasingly to emphasize. These were the Jeffersonian and Jacksonian ideas of equality, which obviously clashed with the principles of a society built upon slavery. Thus both sectionalism and nationalism had drawn upon democratic ideas, each using, however, a different basis of selection.

Success in battle gave the North opportunity to impose that aspect of democracy which it had stressed. But, although the victors had reacted violently against slavery, they were in doubt whether their idea of democracy included political equality for the Negro. Scorning for decades the principles of the Abolitionists, northerners had not advanced in 1860 beyond the opinion that the expansion of slavery should no longer be tolerated. Indeed it might easily be argued that during the early war years the South, by fighting for the principle of a voluntary Union, better represented the cause of democracy as the world understood it. The Emancipation Proclamation secured a more favorable hearing for the North, but there was no general enthusiasm for granting the Negro the full panoply of civil and social rights wherever the union flag waved.

Nor did the northern program for recreating the union indicate any great movement in this direction. As the federal troops gradually engulfed the South and the victors faced the problem of administering the conquered territory, there had developed the Lincoln-Johnson plan of reconstruction. A course of action was outlined for each state. After the appointment of a provisional governor by the President there was to be an election of delegates to a state convention. With certain exceptions, all citizens could participate who had been qualified voters before secession and now took an oath of loyalty to the Constitution and the union. The election would be recognized as valid if the vote amounted to one tenth of that cast in the Presidential contest of 1860. The delegates were thereupon to convene and by legislation against secession and slavery comply with northern war aims. Neither Lincoln nor Johnson required other positive action regarding the Negro, although each had suggested that certain qualified blacks be allowed to vote. In no state, however, had their counsel been followed.

The student is already acquainted with some northerners whose ideals would not square with the administration's plans for the Negro. These were the Abolitionists; and such had been the mysterious workings of history that this despised minority, whose persecution by the American people had been a distressing aspect of the 1830s, was a strong influence in the councils of the nation by Civil War times. During the conflict their actions as Republican members of Congress had earned them the name of Radicals or Radical Republicans. Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts and Congressman Thaddeus Stevens of Pennsylvania were their leaders. In mind and spirit they identified themselves with those early Abolitionists whose experience has been recounted in Problem VII. It is not surprising to find them acting with intense feeling on all the important questions—the capacity of northern generals, the Constitution in wartime, the nature of the union, relations with the South, and the status of the Negro.

After Sumter the Radicals particularly held the initiative on the question of the slave, and their attitude, viewed in the light of contemporary northern opinion, explains in part why they became known as extremists. While the Lincoln administration was carefully defining its war aim in terms of a perpetual union, the Radicals welcomed and defended the actions of incautious generals who proclaimed freedom in their areas of command. Very early in the war they urged the executive to promulgate emancipation, and after the Proclamation they devoted their energies to such related matters as securing equal pay for the Negro in the Union army and obtaining civil privileges for him in the District of Columbia.

It seems clear in what direction the Radical program for the Negro was tending, but did it have a final goal for him? Until 1865 this was largely an academic question because these reformers had constituted only one wing of the Republican party and, although they had influenced policy, it cannot be said that they had dominated it. Generally Lincoln had maintained control. But his assassination and other events of 1865 secured them political leadership and with it the power to implement their plans for the ex-slave. In a very short time it became apparent that they intended the Negro to have those political and civil rights which the first Abolitionists had promised thirty years before at their convention in Independence Hall, Philadelphia (Problem VII, p. 193).

To achieve their objectives the Radicals were even willing to advocate a change in the form of government. They would have concentrated authority in Washington, whereas the union, even after the Civil War, rested upon a division of powers between state and nation. Within this completely national government Congress was to wield exclusive power, no longer sharing with executive and judiciary. There will be no attempt here to study every aspect of the Radical program, for that would require a number of Problems. This Problem will emphasize, rather, one particular measure: suffrage for the Negro. To the great majority of Radicals

the vote seemed the most promising way of raising the Negro to par with the white. To the opposition this extension of the franchise came to symbolize the ultimate evil of the Radical program. In the resulting conflict, ideas about the nation, the section, and democracy, which have appeared constantly in these Problems, are in a new setting carried past the Civil War into modern times.

Part I.

THE ISSUE OF NEGRO SUFFRAGE

The struggle over the franchise has occupied a central position in the political history of Western civilization. Especially in the nineteenth century the right to vote was the subject of bitter controversy. The middle and working classes saw in it the opportunity to wield governmental powers which had been for centuries the prerogative of an aristocracy or a small property-holding class, while the latter groups offered stout opposition, unwilling to share power or doubting that other elements had the ability to rule. In Europe the French Revolution began the movement toward universal suffrage. In this country it was, of course, the American Revolution. And many of the leading events of the following century involved in some way a question of the franchise—the revolutions of 1830 and 1848 on the Continent, the less violent British parliamentary reforms of '32 and '67, and Jacksonian democracy in the United States, which marked the virtual abolition of property qualifications. The dispute after the Civil War was only the latest of these and, as we now know, by no means the last. The issue of woman suffrage in the early twentieth century and the current world struggles over the ballot box, its use or abuse, testify to the unending importance of this political mechanism.

A.

THE RADICAL REPUBLICAN IDEAL

By the time the 39th Congress assembled in December 1865, all the former Confederate states except Texas had taken advantage of the Lincoln-Johnson "ten percent" plan to organize governments, to comply with the northern conditions regarding secession, slavery, and the state confederate debt, and to elect representatives to Congress. The latter were now in Washington, asking admission to House and Senate. But the Radicals were in control and, refusing to seat the southerners, turned instead to their own legislation. For various reasons they accomplished the suffrage part of their program only slowly; the Fifteenth Amendment, protecting the Negro's right to vote against state or national encroachment, was ratified as late as 1870. Early or late, however, they expressed their views and the following selections are given as representative.

1. *The Sumner Thesis.* Charles Sumner (1811-74), Republican senator from Massachusetts, was a strong advocate of Negro suffrage. Prominent in the struggle against slavery in the 1850s, he had become by 1865 the unchallenged Congressional champion of Negro rights. The following is from a speech in the Senate, February 6, 1866. His appeal to a tradition, his view of the white man's world position, and his opinion of the Negro are especially significant.¹

The freedman must be protected. To this you are specially pledged by the Proclamation of President Lincoln, which, after declaring him "free," promises to *maintain* this freedom, not for any limited period, but for all time. But this cannot be done so long as you deny him the shield of *impartial laws*. Let him be heard in court and let him vote. Let these rights be guarded sacredly. Beyond even the shield of *impartial laws*, he will

then have that protection which comes from the consciousness of manhood. Clad in the full panoply of citizenship he will feel at last that he is a man. At present he is only a recent chattel, awaiting your justice to be transmuted into manhood. If you would have him respected in his rights, you must begin by respecting him in your laws. If you would maintain him in his freedom, you must begin by maintaining him in the equal rights of citizenship. . . .

Foremost is the Equality of all men. Of course, in a declaration of rights, no such supreme folly was intended as that all men are created equal in form or capacity, bodily, or mental; but simply that they are created equal in rights. This is the first of the self-evident truths that are announced, leading and governing all the rest. Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are among inalienable rights; but they are all held in subordination to that primal truth. Here is the starting-point of the whole, and the end is like

the starting-point. In announcing that Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, the Declaration repeats again the same proclamation of Equal Rights. Thus is Equality the Alpha and Omega, in which all other rights are embraced. Men may not have a natural right to certain things, but most clearly they have a natural right to *impartial laws*, by which they shall be secured in Equal Rights. Equality in rights is the first of rights. . . .

Taking the sum total of the population in the eleven states, we find 5,447,222 whites to 3,666,110 colored persons; and you are now to decide, whether in the discharge of your duties under the Constitution, and bound to guaranty a Republican form of government, you will disfranchise this mighty mass, shutting them out from those Equal Rights promised by our fathers, and from all voice in the government of their country. They surpass in numbers, by at least a million, the whole population of the colonies at the time our fathers raised the cry, "Taxation without Representation is Tyranny;" and now you are to decide whether you will strip them of representation while you subject them to a grinding taxation by tariff and excise, acting directly and indirectly, which dwarfs into insignificance everything attempted by the British Parliament. . . .

Let me be understood. What I especially ask is impartial suffrage, which is, of course, embraced in universal suffrage. What is universal is necessarily impartial. For the present, I simply insist that all shall be equal before the law, so that, in the enjoyment of this right, there shall be no restriction which is not equally applicable to all. Any further question, in the nature of "qualification," belongs to another stage of the debate. And yet I have no hesitation in saying that universal suffrage is a universal right, subject only to such regulations as the safety of society may require. These may concern (1) age, (2) character, (3) registration, (4) residence. Nobody doubts that minors may be excluded, and so, also, persons of infamous life. Registration and residence are both prudential requirements for the safeguard of the ballot-box against the Nomads and Bohemians of politics, and to compel the exercise of this franchise where a person is known among his neighbors and friends. Education also, may, under certain circumstances, be a requirement of prudence, especially valuable in a Republic, where so much depends on the intelligence of the people. These temporary restrictions do not in any way interfere with the right of suffrage, for they leave it *absolutely accessible to all*. . . .

You have already proclaimed Emancipation; proclaim Enfranchisement also. And do not stultify yourselves by setting at naught the practical principle of the Fathers, that all just government stands only on the consent of the governed, and

its inseparable corollary, that *taxation without representation is tyranny*. What was once true is true forever, although we may for a time lose sight of it, and this is the case with those imperishable truths to which you have been, alas! so indifferent. Thus far the work is only *half done*. . . .

According to the best testimony now, the population of the earth—embracing Caucasians, Mongolians, Malays, Africans, and Americans—is about thirteen hundred millions, of whom only three hundred and seventy-five millions are "white men," or little less than one-fourth, so that, in claiming exclusive rights for "white men," you degrade nearly three-quarters of the Human Family, made in the "image of God" and declared to be of "one blood," while you sanction a Caste offensive to religion, an Oligarchy inconsistent with Republican Government, and a Monopoly which has the whole world as its footstool.

Against this assumption I protest with mind, soul, and heart. It is false in religion, false in statesmanship, and false in economy. It is an extravagance, which, if enforced, is foolish tyranny. Show me a creature, with erect countenance looking to heaven, made in the image of God, and I show you a MAN, who, of whatever country or race, whether darkened by equatorial sun or blanched by northern cold, is with you a child of the Heavenly Father, and equal with you in title to all the rights of Human Nature.

2 *Carl Schurz' Opinion*. Carl Schurz (1829–1906) was a German exile from the Revolution of 1848, who had been an active campaigner for Lincoln and served as a general during the Civil War. In 1865 President Andrew Johnson sent him to study conditions in the South. From July to September he traveled there, gathering materials for a report which was subsequently published as a Congressional document. His reason for giving the Negro the suffrage is one that Sumner mentions only briefly; Schurz develops it at some length.²

As the most difficult of the pending questions are intimately connected with the status of the negro in southern society, it is obvious that a correct solution can be more easily obtained if he has a voice in the matter. In the right to vote he would find the best permanent protection against oppressive class-legislation, as well as against individual persecution. The relations between the white and black races, even if improved by the gradual wearing off of the present animosities, are likely to remain long under the troubling influence of prejudice. It is a notorious fact that the rights of a man of some political power are far less exposed to violation than those of one who is, in matters of public interest, completely subject

to the will of others. A voter is a man of influence; small as that influence may be in the single individual, it becomes larger when that individual belongs to a numerous class of voters who are ready to make common cause with him for the protection of his rights. Such an individual is an object of interest to the political parties that desire to have the benefit of his ballot. It is true, the bringing face to face at the ballot-box of the white and black races may here and there lead to an outbreak of feeling, and the first trials ought certainly to be made while the national power is still there to prevent or repress disturbances; but the practice once successfully inaugurated under the protection of that power, it would probably be more apt than anything else to obliterate old antagonisms, especially if the colored people—which is probable, as soon as their own rights are sufficiently secured—divide their votes between the different political parties.

The effect of the extension of the franchise to the colored people upon the development of free labor and upon the security of human rights in the south being the principal object in view, the objections raised on the ground of the ignorance of the freedmen become unimportant. Practical liberty is a good school, and, besides, if any qualification can be found, applicable to both races, which does not interfere with the attainment of the main object, such qualification would in that respect be unobjectionable. But it is idle to say that it will be time to speak of negro suffrage when the whole colored race will be educated, for the ballot may be necessary to him to secure his education.

3. *Thaddeus Stevens*. The words of Sumner and Schurz developed the arguments for Negro suffrage on the high plane of democratic

idealism. But northerners had other reasons for supporting this reform, and Thaddeus Stevens, leader of the Radicals in the House of Representatives, stated these in a Congressional speech of January 3, 1867. The passions aroused by war were still strong in Stevens, and he was also acutely aware that political factors were involved in the suffrage decision. If the idealists should become disillusioned, they might look with far less enthusiasm on a reform supported only by such motives as Stevens avowed, and even decide to abandon the cause of Negro suffrage.³

Another good reason is, it would insure the ascendancy of the Union party. Do you avow the party purpose? exclaims some horror-stricken demagogue. I do. For I believe, on my conscience, that on the continued ascendancy of that party depends the safety of this great nation. If impartial suffrage is excluded in the rebel States then every one of them is sure to send a solid rebel representative delegation to Congress, and cast a solid rebel electoral vote. They, with their kindred Copperheads of the North, would always elect the President and control Congress. While slavery sat upon her defiant throne, and insulted and intimidated the trembling North, the South frequently divided on questions of policy between Whigs and Democrats, and gave victory alternately to the sections. Now, you must divide them between loyalists, without regard to color, and disloyalists, or you will be the perpetual vassals of the free-trade, irritated, revengeful South. For these, among other reasons, I am for negro suffrage in every rebel State. If it be just, it should not be denied; if it be necessary, it should be adopted; if it be a punishment to traitors, they deserve it.

B.

SOUTHERN AND NORTHERN OPINION

Aware that Abolitionist views were far from representative of the nation at large, the student may wonder what was the general attitude toward suffrage for the freedman. In the South this question was only a part of the broader one—what was to be the societal status of the Negro now that slavery was irretrievably gone. Between October 1865 and March 1866 the southern states gave a partial answer by enacting legislation which became known as the Black Codes. These laws promulgated certain basic rights and responsibilities for the ex-slaves; marriage was established among them and parental relations recognized; they were given the power to sue and be sued and to testify in court if others of their race were concerned. But the legislators had also included many restrictions such as requiring young Negroes to apprentice themselves to employers or obliging older Negroes to sign yearly labor contracts. Furthermore, other sections of the codes placed them in a condition approximating slavery; their freedom to assemble was limited, their movements were restricted, they were denied the privilege of bearing arms. No provision was made for their serving as jurors, joining the militia, or exercising the suffrage.

Certain of the following selections will illustrate the feeling which motivated southern legislative policy. There will also be something on northern opinion. The victors were facing the question of Negro suffrage in their home states and also had their views about

it in the South. Then the Negro speaks. Educated by the Abolitionists, he was becoming active politically, no longer remaining the central but mute issue of quarreling whites.

1. *Governor B. G. Humphreys of Mississippi.* The first elected governor of postwar Mississippi was B. G. Humphreys, a lifelong Whig and an opponent of secession. The following excerpt is from his inaugural address of October 1865. Prior to these words Humphreys had quoted extensively from "Mr. Lincoln's" Charleston (Ill.) speech of September 18, 1858. It will be remembered that during this debate with Douglas, Lincoln had expressed opposition to "the social and political equality" of the black and white races. Humphreys then proposed what the state of Mississippi should do about the Negroes.⁴

The sudden emancipation of her slaves has devolved upon her the highest responsibilities and duties. Several hundred thousand of the negro race, unfitted for political equality with the white race, have been turned loose upon society; and in the guardianship she may assume over this race, she must deal justly with them, and protect them in all their rights of person and property. The highest degree of elevation in the scale of civilization to which they are capable, morally and intellectually, must be secured to them by their education and religious training; but they can not be admitted to political or social equality with the white race. [Here again was a repetition of Lincoln's solemnly asserted convictions.] It is due to ourselves—to the white immigrant invited to our shores—and it should never be forgotten—that ours is and ever shall be a government of white men. The purity and progress of both races require that caste must be maintained, and intermarriage between the races be forbidden. . . . To work is the law of God, and the only certain protection against the pauperism and crime of both races. The negro is peculiarly adapted to the cultivation of the great staples of the South. He should be encouraged to engage at once in their production, by assurances of protection against the avarice, cupidity and injustice of his employer. He is free to choose his own labor and make his own bargain. But he should be *required* to choose *some* employment that will insure the maintenance of himself and family.

On the other hand, the employer must be assured that the labor contracted for will be specifically performed. The cultivation of the great staples of the South requires continuous labor from January to January. The planter can not venture upon their cultivation unless the laborer is compelled to comply with his contract,—remaining and performing his proper amount of labor, day after day, and week after week through the

whole year; and if he attempt to escape he should be returned to his employer, and forced to work until the time for which he has contracted has expired. By such a system of labor the welfare and happiness of the African may be secured, the agricultural and commercial prosperity of the State sustained, and our homes again become the abode of plenty.

2. *President Johnson Interviews a Group of Negroes.* Humphreys belonged to the planter class, and, since that group formed only a small part of southern society, it becomes important to include opinion of other elements. Among these were the poor and nonslaveholding whites. Increasingly significant in southern life, these small farmers and laborers were to capture political power in the 1890s through the movement known as the Populist Revolt. Their leaders generally took a strong stand against the Negro. President Andrew Johnson, who had plied the trade of a tailor in Tennessee before he entered politics, was an earlier example of this class. In 1866, when he was offering strong but futile opposition to the Radicals, he interviewed a group of Negroes. Selections from this interview⁵ suggest several questions. In what way did Johnson have the outlook of a "poor white"? Who are the two great enemies of the nonslaveholder? Why? What constitutional issue does Johnson think is involved in the Negro-suffrage question?

February 7, 1866—The delegation of colored representatives from different States of the country, now in Washington, to urge the interests of the colored people before the Government, had an interview with the President.

The President shook hands kindly with each member of the delegation.

ADDRESS OF GEORGE T. DOWNING

MR. GEORGE T. DOWNING then addressed the President as follows:

"We present ourselves to your Excellency, to make known with pleasure the respect which we are glad to cherish for you—a respect which is your due, as our Chief Magistrate. It is our desire for you to know that we come feeling that we are friends meeting a friend. We should, however, have manifested our friendship by not coming to further tax your already much burdened and valuable time; but we have another object in calling. We are in a passage to equality before the law. God hath made it by opening a Red Sea. We would have your assistance through the same. We

come to you in the name of the colored people of the United States. We are delegated to come by some who have unjustly worn iron manacles on their bodies—by some whose minds have been manacled by class legislation in States called free. The colored people of the States of Illinois, Wisconsin, Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, New York, New England States, and District of Columbia have specially delegated us to come.

"Our coming is a marked circumstance, noting determined hope that we are not satisfied with an amendment prohibiting slavery, but that we wish it enforced with appropriate legislation. This is our desire. We ask for it intelligently, with the knowledge and conviction that the fathers of the Revolution intended freedom for every American; that they should be protected in their rights as citizens, and be equal before the law. We are Americans, native born Americans. We are citizens; we are glad to have it known to the world that you bear no doubtful record on this point. On this fact, and with confidence in the triumph of justice, we base our hope. We see no recognition of color or race in the organic law of the land. It knows no privileged class, and therefore we cherish the hope that we may be fully enfranchised, not only here in this District, but throughout the land. We respectfully submit that rendering anything less than this will be rendering to us less than our just due; that granting anything less than our full rights will be a disregard of our just rights and of due respect for our feelings. If the powers that be do so it will be used as a license, as it were, or an apology, for any community, or for individuals thus disposed, to outrage our rights and feelings. It has been shown in the present war that the Government may justly reach its strong arm into States, and demand from them, from those who owe it allegiance, their assistance and support. May it not reach out a like arm to secure and protect its subject upon who it has a claim?" . . .

RESPONSE OF THE PRESIDENT

"In reply to some of your inquiries, not to make a speech about this thing, for it is always best to talk plainly and distinctly about such matters, I will say that if I have not given evidence in my course that I am a friend of humanity, and to that portion of it which constitutes the colored population, I can give no evidence here. Everything that I have had, both as regards life and property, has been perilled in that cause, and I feel and think that I understand—not to be egotistic—what should be the true direction of this question, and what course of policy would result in the melioration and ultimate elevation, not only of the colored but of the great mass of people of the United

States. I say that if I have not given evidence that I am a friend of humanity, and especially the friend of the colored man, in my past conduct, there is nothing that I can now do that would. I repeat, all that I possessed, life, liberty, and property, have been put up in connection with that question, when I had every inducement held out to take the other course, by adopting which I would have accomplished perhaps all that the most ambitious might have desired. If I know myself, and the feelings of my own heart, they have been for the colored man. I have owned slaves and bought slaves, but I never sold one. I might say, however, that practically, so far as my connection with slaves has gone, I have been their slave instead of their being mine. Some have even followed me here, while others are occupying and enjoying my property with my consent. For the colored race my means, my time, my all has been perilled; and now at this late day, after giving evidence that is tangible, that is practical, I am free to say to you that I do not like to be arraigned by some who can get up handsomely-rounded periods and deal in rhetoric, and talk about abstract ideas of liberty, who never perilled life, liberty, or property. This kind of theoretical, hollow, unpractical friendship amounts to but very little. While I say I am a friend of the colored man, I do not want to adopt a policy that I believe will end in a contest between the races, which if persisted in will result in the extermination of one or the other. God forbid that I should be engaged in such a work!

"Now, it is always best to talk about things practically and in a common sense way. Yes, I have said, and I repeat here, that if the colored man in the United States could find no other Moses, or any Moses that would be more able and efficient than myself, I would be his Moses to lead him from bondage to freedom; that I would pass him from a land where he had lived in slavery to a land (if it were in our reach) of freedom. Yes, I would be willing to pass with him through the Red sea to the Land of Promise, to the land of liberty; but I am not willing, under either circumstance, to adopt a policy which I believe will only result in the sacrifice of his life and the shedding of his blood. I think I know what I say. I feel what I say; and I feel well assured that if the policy urged by some be persisted in, it will result in great injury to the white as well as to the colored man. There is a great deal of talk about the sword in one hand accomplishing an end, and the ballot accomplishing another at the ballot-box.

"These things all do very well, and sometimes have forcible application. We talk about justice; we talk about right; we say that the white man has been in the wrong in keeping the black man in slavery as long as he has. That is all true. Again,

we talk about the Declaration of Independence and equality before the law. You understand all that, and know how to appreciate it. But, now, let us look each other in the face; let us go to the great mass of colored men throughout the slave States; let us take the condition in which they are at the present time—and it is bad enough, we all know—and suppose, by some magic touch you could say to every one, ‘you shall vote to-morrow;’ how much would that ameliorate their condition at this time?

“Now, let us get closer up to this subject, and talk about it. [The President here approached very near to Mr. Douglass.] What relation has the colored man and the white man heretofore occupied in the South? I opposed slavery upon two grounds. First, it was a great monopoly, enabling those who controlled and owned it to constitute an aristocracy, enabling the few to derive great profits and rule the many with an iron rod, as it were. And this is one great objection to it in a government, it being a monopoly. I was opposed to it secondly upon the abstract principle of slavery. Hence, in getting clear of a monopoly, we are getting clear of slavery at the same time. So you see there were two right ends accomplished in the accomplishment of the one.”

MR. DOUGLASS. “Mr. President, do you wish—”

THE PRESIDENT. “I am not quite through yet.

“Slavery has been abolished. A great national guarantee has been given, one that cannot be revoked. I was getting at the relation that subsisted between the white man and the colored man. A very small proportion of white persons compared with the whole number of such owned the colored people of the South. I might instance the State of Tennessee in illustration. There were there twenty-seven non-slaveholders to one slaveholder, and yet the slave power controlled the State. Let us talk about this matter as it is. Although the colored man was in slavery there, and owned as property in the sense and in the language of that locality and of that community, yet, in comparing his condition and his position there with the non-slaveholder, he usually estimated his importance just in proportion to the number of slaves that his master owned with the non-slaveholder.

“Have you ever lived upon a plantation?”

MR. DOUGLASS. “I have, your excellency.”

THE PRESIDENT. “When you would look over and see a man who had a large family, struggling hard upon a poor piece of land, you thought a great deal less of him than you did of your own master’s negro, didn’t you?”

MR. DOUGLASS. “Not I!”

THE PRESIDENT. “Well, I know such was the case with a large number of you in those sections. Where such is the case we know there is an enmity, we know there is a hate. The poor white man, on

the other hand, was opposed to the slave and his master; for the colored man and his master combined kept him in slavery, by depriving him of a fair participation in the labor and productions of the rich land of the country.

“Don’t you know that a colored man, in going to hunt a master (as they call it) for the next year, preferred hiring to a man who owned slaves rather than to a man who did not? I know the fact, at all events. They did not consider it quite as respectable to hire to a man who did not own negroes as to one who did.”

MR. DOUGLASS. “Because he wouldn’t be treated as well.”

THE PRESIDENT. “Then that is another argument in favor of what I am going to say. It shows that the colored man appreciated the slave owner more highly than he did the man who didn’t own slaves. Hence the enmity between the colored man and the non-slaveholders. The white man was permitted to vote before—government was derived from him. He is a part and parcel of the political machinery.

“Now, by the rebellion or revolution—and when you come back to the objects of this war, you find that the abolition of slavery was not one of the objects; Congress and the President himself declared that it was waged on our part in order to suppress the rebellion—the abolition of slavery has come as an incident to the suppression of a great rebellion—as an incident, and as an incident we should give it the proper direction.

“The colored man went into this rebellion a slave; by the operation of the rebellion he came out a freedman—equal to a freeman in any other portion of the country. Then there is a great deal done for him on this point. The non-slaveholder who was forced into the rebellion, who was as loyal as those that lived beyond the limits of the State, but was carried into it, lost his property, and in a number of instances the lives of such were sacrificed, and he who has survived has come out of it with nothing gained, but a great deal lost.

“Now, upon the principle of justice, should they be placed in a condition different from what they were before? On the other hand, one has gained a great deal; on the other hand, one has lost a great deal, and, in a political point of view, scarcely stands where he did before.

“Now, we are talking about where we are going to begin. We have got at the hate that existed between the two races. The query comes up, whether these two races, situated as they were before, without preparation, without time for passion and excitement to be appeased, and without time for the slightest improvement, whether the one should be turned loose upon the other, and be thrown together at the ballot-box with this enmity and hate existing between them. The query comes up right

there, whether we don't commence a war of races. I think I understand this thing, and especially is this the case when you force it upon a people without their consent.

"You have spoken about government. Where is power derived from? We say it is derived from the people. Let us take it so, and refer to the District of Columbia by way of illustration. Suppose, for instance, here, in this political community, which, to a certain extent, must have government, must have laws, and putting it now upon the broadest basis you can put it—take into consideration the relation which the white has heretofore borne to the colored race—is it proper to force upon this community, without their consent, the elective franchise, without regard to color, making it universal?

"Now, where do you begin? Government must have a controlling power—must have a lodgment. For instance, suppose Congress should pass a law authorizing an election to be held at which all over twenty-one years of age, without regard to color, should be allowed to vote, and a majority should decide at such election that the elective franchise should not be universal; what would you do about it? Who would settle it? Do you deny that first great principle of the right of the people to govern themselves? Will you resort to an arbitrary power, and say a majority of the people shall receive a state of things they are opposed to?"

MR. DOUGLASS. "That was said before the war."

THE PRESIDENT. "I am now talking about a principle; not what somebody else said."

MR. DOWNING. "Apply what you have said, Mr. President, to South Carolina, for instance, where a majority of the inhabitants are colored."

THE PRESIDENT. "Suppose you go to South Carolina; suppose you go to Ohio. That doesn't change the principle at all. The query to which I have referred still comes up when government is undergoing a fundamental change. Government commenced upon this principle; it has existed upon it; and you propose now to incorporate into it an element that didn't exist before. I say the query comes up in undertaking this thing whether we have a right to make a change in regard to the elective franchise in Ohio, for instance: whether we shall not let the people in that State decide the matter for themselves.

"Each community is better prepared to determine the depositary of its political power than anybody else, and it is for the Legislature, for the people of Ohio to say who shall vote, and not for the Congress of the United States. I might go down here to the ballot-box to-morrow and vote directly for universal suffrage; but if a great majority of the people said no, I should consider it would be tyrannical in me to attempt to force such upon them without their will. It is a fundamental tenet

in my creed that the will of the people must be obeyed. Is there anything wrong or unfair in that?"

MR. DOUGLASS. (smiling) "A great deal that is wrong, Mr. President, with all respect."

THE PRESIDENT. "It is the people of the States that must for themselves determine this thing. I do not want to be engaged in a work that will commence a war of races. I want to begin the work of preparation, and the States, or the people in each community, if a man demeans himself well, and shows evidence that this new state of affairs will operate, will protect him in all his rights, and give him every possible advantage when they become reconciled socially and politically to this state of things. Then will this new order of things work harmoniously; but forced upon the people before they are prepared for it, it will be resisted, and work inharmoniously. I feel a conviction that driving this matter upon the people, upon the community, will result in the injury of both races, and the ruin of one or the other. God knows I have no desire but the good of the whole human race. I would it were so that all you advocate could be done in the twinkling of an eye; but it is not in the nature of things, and I do not assume or pretend to be wiser than Providence, or stronger than the laws of nature.

"Let us now seek to discover the laws governing this thing. There is a great law controlling it; let us endeavor to find out what that law is, and conform our actions to it. All the details will then properly adjust themselves and work out well in the end.

"God knows that anything I can do I will do. In the mighty process by which the great end is to be reached, anything I can do to elevate the races, to soften and ameliorate their condition I will do, and to be able to do so is the sincere desire of my heart.

"I am glad to have met you, and thank you for the compliments you have paid me."

MR. DOUGLASS. "I have to return to you our thanks, Mr. President, for so kindly granting us this interview. We did not come here expecting to argue this question with your excellency, but simply to state what were our views and wishes in the premises. If we were disposed to argue the question, and you would grant us permission, of course we would endeavor to controvert some of the positions you have assumed."

MR. DOWNING. "Mr. Douglass, I take it that the President, by his kind expressions and his very full treatment of the subject, must have contemplated some reply to the views which he has advanced, and in which we certainly do not concur, and I say this with due respect."

THE PRESIDENT. "I thought you expected me to indicate to some extent what my views were on

the subjects touched upon by your statement."

MR. DOWNING. "We are very happy, indeed, to have heard them."

MR. DOUGLASS. "If the President will allow me, I would like to say one or two words in reply. You enfranchise your enemies and disfranchise your friends."

THE PRESIDENT. "All I have done is simply to indicate what my views are, as I supposed you expected me to, from your address."

MR. DOUGLASS. "My own impression is that the very thing that your excellency would avoid in the southern States can only be avoided by the very measure that we propose, and I would state to my brother delegates that because I perceive the President has taken strong grounds in favor of a given policy, and distrusting my own ability to remove any of those impressions which he has expressed, I thought we had better end the interview with the expression of thanks." (Addressing the President.) "But if your excellency will be pleased to hear, I would like to say a word or two in regard to that one matter of the enfranchisement of the blacks as a means of preventing the very thing which your excellency seems to apprehend—that is a conflict of races."

THE PRESIDENT. "I repeat, I merely wanted to indicate my views in reply to your address, and not to enter into any general controversy, as I could not well do so under the circumstances."

"Your statement was a very frank one, and I thought it was due to you to meet it in the same spirit."

MR. DOUGLASS. "Thank you, sir."

THE PRESIDENT. "I think you will find, so far as the South is concerned, that if you will all inculcate there the idea in connection with the one you urge, that the colored people can live and advance in civilization to better advantage elsewhere than crowded right down there in the South, it would be better for them."

MR. DOUGLASS. "But the masters have the making of the laws, and we cannot get away from the plantation."

THE PRESIDENT. "What prevents you?"

MR. DOUGLASS. "We have not the single right of locomotion through the Southern States now."

THE PRESIDENT. "Why not; the government furnishes you with every facility."

MR. DOUGLASS. "There are six days in the year that the negro is free in the South now, and his master then decides for him where he shall go, where he shall work, and how much he shall work—in fact, he is divested of all political power. He is absolutely in the hands of those men."

THE PRESIDENT. "If the master now controls him or his action, would he not control him in his vote?"

MR. DOUGLASS. "Let the negro once understand

that he has an organic right to vote, and he will raise up a party in the Southern States among the poor, who will rally with him. There is this conflict that you speak of between the wealthy slaveholder and the poor man."

THE PRESIDENT. "You touch right upon the point there. There is this conflict, and hence I suggest emigration. If he cannot get employment in the South, he has it in his power to go where he can get it."

In parting the PRESIDENT said that they were both desirous of accomplishing the same ends, but proposed to do so by following different roads.

MR. DOUGLASS, on turning to leave, remarked to his fellow delegates: "The President sends us to the people, and we go to the people."

THE PRESIDENT. "Yes, sir; I have great faith in the people. I believe they will do what is right."

3. *Northern Skepticism about Negro Suffrage.* In 1865 only five states of the union allowed Negroes to vote—that is, all New England except Connecticut. Between that year and 1869 eight other northern states rejected amendments to their constitutions, providing for Negro suffrage. Reasons for this action were mixed. Many a northerner believed in "white supremacy." But there were others not prejudiced against the Negro who felt that the measure was unwise, particularly for the South. Two modern historians summarize this opinion.⁶

[Howard K. Beale]

David D. Field, an eminent New York jurist, expressed a general sentiment when he said, "The elective franchise is not a natural right, but a political trust. . . . Because the blacks have fought for the country, that does not necessarily give them the right to govern it. . . . It is a curious feature of the Freedmen's Bill . . . that it took the blacks under the protection of the Federal Government, as if they were not able to take care of themselves, while the same persons who urged . . . the measure are the most clamorous to give this same dependent population a large share in the Government of the country." General Howard of the Freedmen's Bureau "hoped that it might be limited at least by an educational qualification." "The gross ignorance," he said, "of the mass of colored soldiers rendered them especial objects of . . . extortion and fraud." He favored negro suffrage under an educational qualification, and hoped the Bureau would be maintained to educate the negro. "A people who are just emerging from the barbarism of slavery," Morton told the Indiana Legislature, "are not qualified to become a part of our political system, and take part not only in Government of themselves and their neighbors,

but of the whole United States. So far from believing that negro suffrage is a remedy for all our national ills, I doubt whether it is a remedy for any, and rather believe that its enforcement by Congress would be more likely to subject the negro to a merciless persecution, than to confer upon him any substantial benefit." Major General Sickles of the Freedmen's Bureau in Charleston declared, "Mr. Sumner would not be in such a hurry to confer negro suffrage, if he could see the plantation negroes and thus comprehend how hopelessly they lack capacity for political franchises."

[George Fort Milton]

In 1865, the President's military chiefs in the South were almost a unit against the imposition of negro suffrage. Sherman informed Chase that "to give all loyal negroes the same political status as white voters will revive the war," and wrote his wife: "Stanton wants to kill me because I do not favor the scheme of declaring the negroes of the South, now free, to be loyal voters, whereby politicians may manufacture just so much more pliable

electioneering material. The negroes don't want to vote. They want to work and enjoy property." Senator Sherman was frank with his soldier brother. "I admit," he wrote on May 16, "the negroes are not intelligent enough to vote, but someone must vote their political representation in the states where they live . . . Who shall exercise this political power?"

During his visit to Raleigh in April, Grant had been impressed with the sad prospect of the South, and wrote his wife that "the suffering that must exist in the South the next year . . . will be beyond conception. People who talk of further retaliation and punishment, except of the political leaders, either do not conceive of the suffering endured already, or they are heartless and unfeeling . . ." A little later Schofield wrote Grant "of the absolute unfitness of the negroes as a class to vote. They can neither read nor write; they have no knowledge whatever of law or government; they do not even know the meaning of the freedom that has been given them, and are much astonished when they are informed that it does not mean they are to live in idleness and be fed by the Government."

Part II.

THE DEFEAT OF THE RADICAL PROGRAM

For a time the Radicals had their way. Supreme in Congress they passed over the President's veto a civil-rights bill designed to protect the Negro against the Black Codes and also, despite executive objections, continued the Freedmen's Bureau, a federal relief agency for the ex-slave. The election of 1866 was a victory for them. The electorate had concluded that the Congressional policy was preferable to one which apparently allowed the recent enemy by means of the Black Codes to legislate the Negro back into slavery, and Johnson did not possess the qualities of leadership which could sway the voters from this viewpoint.

In 1867, the climactic year of the Congressional program, three Reconstruction Acts were passed. The Lincoln-Johnson governments were replaced by the military, who had their orders to enroll the Negro as a voter and to proceed with the re-establishment of state organizations. In the following years the Fourteenth Amendment, previously rejected by the southern states, and the Fifteenth Amendment, relating to the suffrage, were sent to the country for ratification. Presumably these additions to the Constitution carried a more permanent guarantee of civil and political liberty to the Negro. While thus implementing policy, Congress reached the apogee of its power in American political history, commanding the army, impeaching the President, and curbing the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. The nature of the entire program and its emphatic enforcement made it easy to believe that the Radicals could not fail to secure the Negro his rights.

In the North the Negro received and has retained the right to vote. In this respect the Radical program was a decided success, growing in significance down through the years as the Negro, migrating north, found the suffrage of some use in fighting for a status. In the South the Radical policy soon collapsed. In 1871 Democratic governments were coming into power; by 1874 most of the ten reconstructed states had gone over to those hostile to northern objectives, and in 1877 in Washington occurred the famous Wormley Conference whereby Republican leaders, assured of Rutherford B. Hayes's election as President, agreed to withdraw federal troops from the South, thus consenting to the overthrow of the last Radical government.

Although the whites now held supremacy, the Negroes did not immediately suffer com-

plete loss of such citizen rights as the franchise. Many, it is true, even before the withdrawal of federal troops, had been denied the ballot through threats or fraud, but the fear of renewed northern intervention, the provisions in state constitutions which could not be changed for some years, and even the fact that many of the blacks had voted Democratic, restrained the dominant race. It was not until the 1890s, when the poorer whites came to political power, that the general movement toward Negro disfranchisement began. By 1910 all the former states of the Confederacy had adopted some method of racial disqualification. Only recently has this action been challenged. The following selections will raise the question whether a more constructive and durable solution of the Negro problem might have been realized during Reconstruction times and then will suggest some of the underlying conditions which explain the rapid decline of the Radical program.

A.

DEFECTS OF A POLITICAL REFORM

The decade after 1865 has long been held the most shameful in the history of American politics. On the national scene there was the bitter feud between Johnson and the Radicals, to be followed by the political immorality of the Grant administration. Locally such organizations as the Tweed ring held sway. Although the Radical governments in the South had established the principles of universal education and of equality before the law, this step forward was largely offset by the incredible incompetence and corruption of the political leaders. Influenced by this knowledge historians have designated the period by such titles as "The Age of Hate" and "The Tragic Era."⁷

If the political venality of the time was a passing phenomenon, never to be equalled again, one still sadder aspect of Reconstruction has left its permanent mark on American society. The democratic idealism of the Civil War seemed to promise the Negro release not only from slavery but also from a caste system of two hundred years' duration. At the end of Reconstruction caste was still effective—a striking contradiction to the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Gettysburg Address. Consequently many have wondered whether the Radical program was the best designed to help the Negro escape from his inferior status. Perhaps there were powerful but unused measures which might have aided the black in his quest for true freedom.

1. *The Douglass Analysis.* The Abolitionists had from the beginning believed in the great potentialities of the Negro and insisted that once free he could go his own way. Thus James G. Birney wrote in 1835 that, "what the colored people really need and nearly all that they need to have done for them separately—is to be set up erect on their feet with full liberty to use their faculties of whatever kind, as others do for their own improvement." This proved to be the philosophy of Reconstruction; the only possible exception was the Freedmen's Bureau, a temporary relief agency. This situation prompted a later comment by Frederick Douglass, an outstanding Negro leader who had escaped from slavery before the Civil War.⁸

And yet the government had left the freedmen in a [bad] condition. . . . It felt that it had done enough for him. It had made him free, and henceforth he must make his own way in the world, or as the slang phrase has it, "Root, pig, or die"; yet he had none of the conditions for self-preservation or self-protection. He was free from the individual

master, but the slave of society. He had neither property, money, nor friends. He was free from the old plantation, but he had nothing but the dusty road under his feet. He was free from the old quarter that once gave him shelter, but a slave to the rains of summer and the frosts of winter. He was in a word literally turned loose naked, hungry, and destitute to the open sky. . . . Now, since poverty has, and can have no chance again[s]t wealth, the landless against the landowner, the ignorant against the intelligent, the freedman was powerless. He had nothing left him but a slavery-distorted and diseased body, and lame and twisted limbs with which to fight the battle of life. . . .

Though they were not slaves they were not yet quite free. No man can be truly free whose liberty is dependent upon the thought, feeling, and action of others; and who has himself no means in his own hands for guarding, protecting, defending, and maintaining that liberty. Yet the negro after his emancipation was precisely in this state of destitution. The law on the side of freedom is of great advantage only where there is power to make that law respected. I know no class of my fellow-men, however just, enlightened, and humane,

which can be wisely and safely trusted absolutely with the liberties of any other class.

2. *Stevens: The Land Question.* If political rights such as the suffrage were not sufficient to advance the Negro, what other aid might have been given him? Several times Thaddeus Stevens urged the federal government to confiscate large estates in the South and distribute them among the freedmen,⁹ but he never could persuade his fellow Radicals to adopt the idea. On March 19, 1867, he introduced in the House of Representatives a bill which embodied this purpose. Some of his words on that occasion are given here. Once before, at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, on September 9, 1865, Stevens had devoted a full oration to the subject and at that time stated the broader philosophy underlying his plans for the redistribution of southern wealth. An excerpt from that speech is the second selection. As political possibilities Stevens's proposals should be viewed in the light of such dominant business opinion as the letter of Henry D. Cooke to his brother, Jay Cooke, in this Problem, p. 351.

[In the House of Representatives, March 19, 1867]

The fourth section provides first that out of the lands thus confiscated each liberated slave who is a male adult, or the head of a family, shall have assigned to him a homestead of forty acres of land, (with \$100 to build a dwelling,) which shall be held for them by trustees during their pupillage.

Let us consider whether this is a just and politic provision.

Whatever may be the fate of the rest of the bill I must earnestly pray that this may not be defeated. On its success, in my judgment, depends not only the happiness and respectability of the colored race, but their very existence. Homesteads to them are far more valuable than the immediate right of suffrage, though both are their due.

Four million persons have just been freed from a condition of dependence, wholly unacquainted with business transactions, kept systematically in ignorance of all their rights and of the common elements of education, without which none of any race are competent to earn an honest living, to guard against the frauds which will always be practiced on the ignorant, or to judge of the most judicious manner of applying their labor. But few of them are mechanics, and none of them skilled manufacturers. They must necessarily, therefore, be the servants and the victims of others unless they are made in some measure independent of their wiser neighbors. The guardianship of the Freedmen's Bureau, that benevolent institution, cannot be expected long to protect them. It en-

counters the hostility of the old slaveholders, whether in official or private station, because it deprives these dethroned tyrants of the luxury of despotism. In its nature it is not calculated for a permanent institution. . . .

Make them independent of their old masters, so that they may not be compelled to work for them upon unfair terms, which can only be done by giving them a small tract of land to cultivate for themselves, and you remove all this danger. You also elevate the character of the freedman. Nothing is so likely to make a man a good citizen as to make him a freeholder. Nothing will so multiply the productions of the South as to divide it into small farms. Nothing will make men so industrious and moral as to let them feel that they are above want and are the owners of the soil which they till.

[At Lancaster, Pennsylvania, September 9, 1865]⁹

They say it is revolution. No doubt it would work a radical reorganization in Southern institutions, habits, and manners. It is intended to revolutionize their principles and feelings. This may startle feeble minds and shake weak nerves. So do all great improvements in the political and moral world. It requires a heavy impetus to drive forward a sluggish people. When it was first proposed to free the slaves and arm the blacks, did not half the nation tremble? The prim conservatives, the snobs, and the male waiting-maids were in hysterics. Heretofore Southern society has had more the features of aristocracy than democracy. The Southern States have been despotisms. It is impossible that any practical equality of rights can exist where a few thousand men monopolize the whole landed property. The larger the number of small proprietors the more safe and stable the government. As the landed interest must govern, the more it is subdivided and held by independent owners the better. How can republican institutions, free schools, free churches, free social intercourse, exist in a mingled community of nabobs and serfs, of owners of twenty-thousand-acre manors, with lordly palaces, and the occupants of narrow huts inhabited by low white trash? If the South is ever to be made a safe republic let her land be cultivated by the toil of its owners, or the free labor of intelligent citizens. This must be done, even though it drive her nobility to exile. The owner of ten thousand acres who drives his coach-and-four feels degraded by sitting at the same table or in the same pew with the embrowned and hard-handed farmer who has himself cultivated his own thriving homestead of one hundred and fifty acres.

⁹ From *The Life of Thaddeus Stevens*, by James Albert Woodburn, copyright 1913, 1941. Used by special permission of the Publishers, The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

3. *The DuBois View.* William E. B. DuBois is a leading Negro historian of Reconstruction. His suggestion for that troubled period is given below. Although less drastic than Stevens's, nonetheless it would have involved a substantial governmental program at a time when government's duties were conceived as strictly limited. Even with all the expansion of governmental functions since that time, there would be today strong opposition to such participation in the individual's life.¹⁰

Suppose, for instance, there had been in the South in 1863 a small but determined and clear-thinking group of men who said: "The Negro is free and to make his freedom real, he must have land and education. He must be guided in his work and development but guided toward freedom and the right to vote. Such complete freedom and the bestowal of suffrage must be a matter of some years, but at present we do not propose to take advantage of this and retain political power based on the non-voting parts of our population. We, therefore, accept the constitutional amendment against slavery; we accept any other amendment which will base representation on voting, or other proposals which will equalize the voting power of North and South. We admit the right of the government to exercise a judicious guardianship over the slaves so long as we have reasonable voice in this guardianship, and that the interests of the

employer as well as the employee shall be kept in mind. And in anticipation of this development, we propose to pass a reasonable code of laws recognizing the new status of the Negro."

If there had been in the white South at this time far-seeing leadership or even some common sense, the subsequent history of Reconstruction and of the Negro in the United States would have been profoundly changed. Suppose a single state like Louisiana had allowed the Negro to vote, with a high property qualification, or the ability to read and write, or service in the army, or all these? Charles Sumner and Thaddeus Stevens would not have been wholly satisfied, but certainly their demands would have been greatly modified. Both of them were perfectly willing to wait for Negro suffrage until the Negro had education and had begun his economic advance. But they did insist that he must have the chance to advance.

There cannot be the slightest doubt that such a program would have gathered enough support in the North to have made the history of Reconstruction not easy and without difficulty, but far less difficult than it proved to be. There were in the South in 1865 men who saw this truth plainly and said so. But true effective leadership was denied them; just as before the war public opinion in the South was hammered into idolatrous worship of slavery, so after the war, even more bitterly and cruelly, public opinion demanded a new unyielding conformity.

B.

IF LINCOLN HAD LIVED

The unfortunate course of Reconstruction history after Lincoln's assassination has caused many to wonder whether he could have avoided the worst features of those times. Could the Great Emancipator have somehow secured the Negro a better position in American society? This speculation has been stimulated by the increasingly favorable opinion of Lincoln, popular legend presenting him as almost divine and critical historians discovering substantial basis for calling him a great man.

1. *A Southern Judgment.* Southerners tended to look upon the death of Lincoln as a calamity. Jefferson Davis himself is reputed to have said that the tragic event was a severe blow to southern interests. Many have since reaffirmed this viewpoint, among them Henry T. Thompson who is very confident that he knows what Lincoln would have demanded of the Confederate states and what he would have left for them to decide.¹¹

President Lincoln and Andrew Johnson, who succeeded to the Presidency upon the assassination of Lincoln on April 15, 1865, held practically the same views in regard to the reconstruction of the South. First, both believed that the Constitution and the laws of the United States placed upon

the President the duty of Reconstruction. Second, they held that the States which attempted to secede had never actually been out of the Union, and that their efforts to leave it had devolved upon these states only two necessary conditions (beyond the renewal of their allegiance), for restoring their relations to the Union, namely, their voiding of all legislation incident to secession, and their acceptance of the emancipation of their slaves. Thus it will be seen that neither Lincoln nor Johnson regarded as necessary to Reconstruction the giving of universal suffrage to the recently freed negro. In fact, both publicly declared they did not favor doing so.

Lincoln's hold upon the people of the North was such that had he lived he would probably have been able to carry through his plan of Re-

construction and the South would thus have been spared a period, the horrors of which were even worse than those of the war. "All the misfortunes of the war itself are insignificant when compared with the sufferings of the people during the era of Reconstruction—1865–1877." But Johnson faced a most trying situation. He was a man of character and considerable ability, who, though a Southerner and a life long Democrat, had refused to follow his section into secession, and had been nominated for Vice President on a "Union ticket" with Lincoln, for the purpose of uniting the Republican voters and the Democratic voters who favored a vigorous prosecution of the war. Yet, because he was a Southerner and a Democrat, Johnson never had the confidence of the Republicans. The radical Republicans who wished to impose upon the South harsh measures after peace, and yet could hardly have successfully challenged Lincoln, were quite willing to try their strength with Johnson.

2. *Lincoln Would Have Succeeded.* Other authors have reached similar conclusions on Lincoln's hypothetical success. They have believed that the generous spirit of the Second Inaugural Address would have restored the union and avoided that further embittering of relations between North and South which Reconstruction witnessed. J. G. Randall has made a brief statement of this kind.¹²

Reconstruction came in harsh, non-Lincolnian terms, and with it an exploitive era of corruption, scandal, and low-grade politics. Ungenerous and vindictive subjugation of the South after Appomattox left a more cruel sting and a more lasting resentment than military defeat, which Lincoln and the army leaders would have followed with a reasonable settlement and a true restoration. Looking back to the day when Lincoln's policy might have been chosen, it can be said that the Union side, at a moment big with possibilities, missed an opportunity. Here was a chance for a magnanimous peace, the terms of which Lincoln had repeatedly stated, particularly in the last speech of his life, three days before the assassination. The chance was lost, and in its place was substituted an unworkable partisan program of radical abuse misnamed "reconstruction," which had to be abandoned by its own promoters.

3. *Lincoln Would Have Failed.* An opposite point of view has been expressed by J. R. Ficklen, one of the better historians of Reconstruction in the South. He doubts whether Lincoln could have calmed the passions aroused by the war; furthermore, he raised the question whether Lincoln, Congress, and the South could have found any grounds for

agreement on the far more difficult question of the Negro.¹³

It has been held by many northern writers and most southern ones that had the life of Lincoln been spared he would have been able, by virtue of his sound judgment and his immense popularity, to carry out the plan of reconstruction begun in Louisiana and to extend it to the rest of the South, thus saving that section from the horrors of congressional reconstruction. To the present writer, however, this view of the matter seems unsound. That Lincoln was far better suited by nature than his tactless successor, Johnson, to soften the asperities of radical legislation is undoubtedly true. The great soul of the president was absolutely free from any feeling of bitterness toward the southern people. While he was ready to combat to its final destruction the theory of state sovereignty and the extension of slavery, he had learned to view the attitude of the South with that large charity which inspired the hearts of so many officers who took part in the conflict on the northern side, the same sentiment that was exhibited in the relations between Grant and Lee at Appomattox. But this sentiment was not widely shared by the members of the national legislature, who were not fighting but were making laws for the Union. That Lincoln would have been permitted by the Congress that met in December, 1865, to recognize state governments established on the one-tenth basis and to make easy the road for the return of "rebels" seems highly improbable. Is it likely, moreover, that he could have prevented the Southern States at the close of the war from exasperating the feelings of the Republican majority in Congress by unwise vagrant laws, and by premature attempts to restore "rebels" to a participation in state and Federal legislation? Or could he have persuaded this Congress to relinquish its determination to deny the suffrage to the "rebel" for his punishment, and to grant it to the freedman for his protection and for the perpetuation of party supremacy? Such influence would doubtless have been beyond the power even of Lincoln's greatness.

4. *Lincoln's Own Program.* The last public address of Abraham Lincoln was delivered on April 11, 1865, four days before his assassination. At that time he spoke seriously to a crowd of serenaders before the White House about his reconstruction plans.¹⁴ His solicitude for the union is quite apparent, as are those qualities of mind which would certainly have facilitated an agreement with Congress on that question. His statements on the Negro show that his views had undergone considerable modification since the Charleston speech of 1858. He offered hope that the Louisiana

legislature would grant suffrage to some Negroes. We now know that this lawmaking body enacted instead a Black Code which could easily have been construed as placing the Negro of that state in peonage. Could Lincoln have controlled the reaction of Congress to this and other similar legislation? As the author of the Gettysburg Address, could he have granted any degree of southern home rule which forced either peonage or an inferior caste status upon the Negro, even though the union was thereby restored? Did he have any means of changing southern opinion on the Negro? This Problem has suggested the herculean task involved in raising the Negro to equality. Did Lincoln have a constructive program for the ex-slave?

We meet this evening, not in sorrow, but in gladness of heart. The evacuation of Petersburg and Richmond, and the surrender of the principal insurgent army, give hope of a righteous and speedy peace whose joyous expression can not be restrained. In the midst of this, however, He from whom all blessings flow, must not be forgotten. A call for a national thanksgiving is being prepared, and will be duly promulgated. . . .

By these recent successes the re-inauguration of the national authority—reconstruction—which has had a large share of thought from the first, is pressed much more closely upon our attention. It is fraught with great difficulty. Unlike a case of a war between independent nations, there is no authorized organ for us to treat with. No one man has authority to give up the rebellion for any other man. We simply must begin with, and mould from, disorganized and discordant elements. Nor is it a small additional embarrassment that we, the loyal people, differ among ourselves as to the mode, manner, and means of reconstruction.

As a general rule, I abstain from reading the reports of attacks upon myself, wishing not to be provoked by that to which I can not properly offer an answer. In spite of this precaution, however, it comes to my knowledge that I am much censured for some supposed agency in setting up, and seeking to sustain, the new State government of Louisiana. In this I have done just so much as, and no more than, the public knows. In the Annual Message of Dec. 1863 and accompanying Proclamation, I presented a plan of re-construction (as the phrase goes) which, I promised, if adopted by any State, should be acceptable to, and sustained by, the Executive government of the nation. I distinctly stated that this was not the only plan which might possibly be acceptable; and I also distinctly protested that the Executive claimed no right to say when, or whether members should

be admitted to seats in Congress from such States. This plan was, in advance, submitted to the then Cabinet, and distinctly approved by every member of it. . . . When the message of 1863, with the plan before mentioned, reached New-Orleans, Gen. Banks wrote me that he was confident the people, with his military co-operation, would reconstruct, substantially on that plan. I wrote him, and some of them to try it; they tried it, and the result is known. Such only has been my agency in getting up the Louisiana government. As to sustaining it, my promise is out, as before stated. But, as bad promises are better broken than kept, I shall treat this as a bad promise, and break it, whenever I shall be convinced that keeping it is adverse to the public interest. But I have not yet been so convinced. . . .

The amount of constituency, so to speak, on which the new Louisiana government rests, would be more satisfactory to all, if it contained fifty, thirty, or even twenty thousand, instead of only about twelve thousand, as it does. It is also unsatisfactory to some that the elective franchise is not given to the colored man. I would myself prefer that it were now conferred on the very intelligent, and on those who serve our cause as soldiers. Still the question is not whether the Louisiana government, as it stands, is quite all that is desirable. The question is, "Will it be wiser to take it as it is, and help to improve it; or to reject, and disperse it?" "Can Louisiana be brought into proper practical relation with the Union sooner by *sustaining*, or by *discarding* her new State government?"

Some twelve thousand voters in the heretofore slave-state of Louisiana have sworn allegiance to the Union, assumed to be the rightful political power of the State, held elections, organized a State government, adopted a free-state constitution, giving the benefit of public schools equally to black and white, and empowering the Legislature to confer the elective franchise upon the colored man. Their Legislature has already voted to ratify the constitutional amendment recently passed by Congress, abolishing slavery throughout the nation. These twelve thousand persons are thus fully committed to the Union, and to perpetual freedom in the state—committed to the very things, and nearly all the things the nation wants—and they ask the nation's recognition and its assistance to make good their committal. Now, if we reject, and spurn them, we do our utmost to disorganize and disperse them. . . . If this course, discouraging and paralyzing both white and black, has any tendency to bring Louisiana into proper practical relations with the Union, I have, so far, been unable to perceive it. If, on the contrary, we recognize, and sustain the new government of Louisiana the converse of all this

is made true. We encourage the hearts, and nerve the arms of the twelve thousand to adhere to their work, and argue for it, and proselyte for it, and fight for it, and feed it, and grow it, and ripen it to a complete success. The colored man too, in seeing all united for him, is inspired with vigilance, and energy, and daring, to the same end. Grant that he desires the elective franchise, will he not attain it sooner by saving the already advanced steps toward it, than by running backward over them? Concede that the new government of Louisiana is only to what it should be as the egg is to the fowl, we shall sooner have the fowl by hatching the egg than by smashing it? . . .

I repeat the question. "Can Louisiana be brought into proper practical relation with the Union *sooner* by *sustaining* or by *discarding* her new State Government?"

What has been said of Louisiana will apply generally to other States. And yet so great peculiarities pertain to each state, and such important and sudden changes occur in the same state; and, withal, so new and unprecedented is the whole case, that no exclusive, and inflexible plan can safely be prescribed as to details and collaterals [*sic*]. Such exclusive, and inflexible plan, would surely become a new entanglement. Important principles may, and must, be inflexible.

C.

THE FORCES OF NATIONALISM

No explanation of Radical frustration is complete without a commentary on the determined opposition of those who had long ruled as the dominant race. Historians have given considerable attention to this successful resistance of a white minority against overwhelming political and military force. It is conceivable, however, that northern efforts might have been stimulated by this opposition instead of collapsing after a few attempts at control. Plainly southern morale, inspired by the ideal of white supremacy, proved stronger than the northern mind under the impulse of a democratic ideal. Had the energies of the victor waned? Or had they been shifted to other fields of endeavor?

1. *Governor Andrew Proposes a Basis for Reunion.* As governor of wartime Massachusetts, John A. Andrew had played a vital role in strengthening the union efforts. In his final message to the Massachusetts legislature on January 4, 1866, he proposed that certain general principles be followed during Reconstruction. It is apparent that Andrew felt that if North and South occupied the ground they had in common, there would be a recreation of the union. This consideration led him to an opinion on Negro suffrage which many a northerner of the time would have seconded.¹⁵

I am confident we cannot re-organize political society with any proper security: 1. Unless we let in the *people* to a co-operation, and not merely an arbitrarily selected portion of them. 2. Unless we give those who are, by their intelligence and character, the natural leaders of the people, and who surely will lead them by and by, an opportunity to lead them now.

I am aware that it has been a favorite dogma in many quarters, "*No Rebel Voters.*" But—it is impossible in certain States to have *any* voting by white men, if only "*loyal men*"—*i.e.*, those who continued so, during the rebellion, are permitted to vote. . . .

The true question is, now, not of past disloyalty,

but of present loyal purpose. We need not try to disguise the fact, that we have passed through a *great popular revolution*. Everybody in the Rebel States was disloyal, with exceptions too few and too far between to comprise a loyal force, sufficient to constitute the State, even now that the armies of the Rebellion are overthrown. Do not let us deceive ourselves. The truth is, the public opinion of the white race in the South was in favor of the rebellion. . . .

The Southern People—as a People—fought, toiled, endured, and persevered, with a courage, a unanimity and a persistency, not outdone by any people in any Revolution. There was never an acre of territory abandoned to the Union while it could be held by arms. There was never a Rebel regiment surrendered to the Union arms until resistance was overcome by force; or a surrender was compelled by the stress of battle, or of military strategy. The people of the South, men and women, soldiers and civilians, volunteers and conscripts, in the army and at home, followed the fortunes of the Rebellion and obeyed its leaders, so long as it had any fortunes or any leaders. Their young men marched up to the cannon's mouth, a thousand times, where they were mowed down like grain by the reapers when the harvest is ripe. . . .

And since the President finds himself obliged to let in the great mass of the disloyal, by the

very terms of his proclamation of amnesty, to a participation in the business of reorganizing the Rebel States, I am obliged also to confess that I think to make one rule for the richer and higher rebels, and another rule for the poorer and more lowly rebels is impolitic and unphilosophical. I find evidence in the granting of pardons, that such also is the opinion of the President.

When the day arrives, which must surely come, when an amnesty, substantially universal, shall be proclaimed, the leading minds of the South, who by temporary policy and artificial rules had been, for the while, disfranchised, will resume their influence and their sway. The capacity of leadership is a gift, not a device. They whose courage, talents and will entitle them to lead, will lead. And these men—not then estopped by their own consent or participation, in the business of reorganization—may not be slow to question the validity of great public transactions enacted during their own disfranchisement. If it is asked, in reply, "What can they do?" and "What can come of their discontent?" I answer, that while I do not know just what they can do, nor what may come of it, neither do I know what they may not attempt, nor what they may not accomplish. I only know that we ought to demand, and to secure, the co-operation of the strongest and ablest minds and the natural leaders of opinion in the South. If we cannot gain their support of the just measures needful for the work of safe re-organization, re-organization will be delusive and full of danger.

Why not try them? They are the most hopeful subjects to deal with, in the very nature of the case. They have the brain and the experience and the education to enable them to understand the exigencies of the present situation. They have the courage, as well as the skill, to lead the people in the direction their judgments point, in spite of their own and the popular prejudice. Weaker men, those of less experience, who have less hold on the public confidence, are comparatively powerless. Is it consistent with reason and our knowledge of human nature, to believe the masses of Southern men able to face about, to turn their backs on those they have trusted and followed, and to adopt the lead of those who have no magnetic hold on their hearts or minds? . . .

But it would be idle to re-organize those States by the colored vote. If the popular vote of the white race is not to be had in favor of the guarantees justly required, then I am in favor of holding on—just where we now are. I am not in favor of a surrender of the present rights of the Union to a struggle between a white minority aided by the freedmen on the one hand, against a majority of the white race on the other. I would not consent, having rescued those States by arms from seces-

sion and rebellion, to turn them over to anarchy and chaos.

2. *Business and Reconstruction.* The Civil War has always been regarded as marking the rise to great national influence of the businessman. What did he consider to be the desirable objectives of Reconstruction? What was his opinion of the Radicals? The following selections provide answers. The first is a letter from Henry David Cooke, a northern banker, to his brother, the well-known Jay Cooke, in which the former comments on a slight reverse the Radicals suffered in some 1867 elections.¹⁶ The second is an editorial in 1867 from the leading northern business journal, the *Commercial and Financial Chronicle*.¹⁷ From this expression of business opinion the student may deduce the probable attitude toward any reform program which might lead to turmoil in the South. What southern group could be relied upon the secure the conditions which the *Chronicle* considers favorable to business?

[Henry David Cooke to Jay Cooke,
February 17, 1867]

About the elections. You know how I have felt for a long time past in regard to the course of the ultra infidelic radicals like Wade, Sumner, Stevens *et id omne genus*. They were dragging the Republican party into all sorts of isms and extremes. Their policy was one of bitterness, hate and wild agrarianism without a single Christian principle to give it consistency, except the sole idea of universal suffrage. And now the party has suffered a check because sound and sober men had begun to lose confidence in its leaders. These reckless demagogues have had their day and the time has come for wiser counsels. With Wade uttering agrarian doctrines in Kansas and fanning the flame of vulgar prejudices, trying to array labor against capital and pandering to the basest passions; with Butler urging wholesale conscription throughout the South and wholesale repudiation throughout the North so far as the national debt is concerned; with Stevens joining hands with the traitor Vallandigham and advocating the idea of a flood of irredeemable paper money sufficient in volume to drown the whole country; with Pomeroy and Wade and Sprague and a host of others clamoring for the unsexing of woman and the putting of the ballot in her hand; with sumptuary laws in Maine invading every man's apple orchard and kitchen pantry and dragging him before the courts if a drop of cider is found on his premises; and in Ohio with a mad project coupling together the enfranchisement of negroes and the disfranchisement of noble white soldiers

who had risked their lives for their country, who had served in the army all through the war and who were not in reality but only technically deserters, what wonder is it that the accumulated load was too heavy for any party to carry and that it broke down under it? For my part I have no tears to shed because I believe that henceforth the Republican party will be purified and will be ten times stronger for the purification.

THE PREVAILING COMMERCIAL DEPRESSION—SOME POSSIBLE ALLEVIATIONS

Last week we indicated the principal causes of the prevailing depression in all branches of business; we now purpose to consider how far the commercial situation is susceptible of remedy from legislative measures.

At the outset we should remember that the present condition of affairs is the consequence of events now past, and can only be remedied by operating on the source or seat of the disease and not directly on its results. If we can help to relieve the present feverish uncertainty, and infuse a healthy confidence among the people; if we can give to capital security in every part of the country so that it may be employed more largely in production and the development of our exhaustless resources, trade will be no longer, as it is now, a mere game of chance, but new life will at once be developed, and influences be brought into play which in time will bring us through all our present difficulties.

And here we are met by the anomalous circumstance that there are now ten millions of our population whose federal status is undetermined. Before the war that portion of our people contributed two thirds of the products by which we were enabled to pay for our large importations; and their purchases in the Northern markets took off fully one-third of our supplies of domestic and foreign merchandise. The lands and the labor which produced the cotton and rice crops and which formed the basis of our large Southern trade still remain, but the capital necessary for rendering them jointly productive is wanting; the consequence is that the process of industrial recuperation in that section is impeded, and, instead of a gradual accumulation of wealth, the people are suffering from a lack of necessary commodities, and our Southern trade is merely nominal. Northern capital waits to seek investment in the lands, the railroads and the factories of the South; but very naturally halts until it is apparent what is to be the future relation of the seceded States to the central Government. Virtually, therefore, the failure of Congress and the President to agree upon a plan of reconstruction keeps the whole machinery of Southern commerce stagnant, by

causing the withholding of the funds which constitute the motive power of industry. Every day that a practicable measure of rehabilitation is postponed augments the sufferings of the Southern people, and diminishes the probabilities that the merchants of that section will be able to liquidate their obligations to the North. There is consequently the most imperative commercial necessity that the discussion of this question should be no longer protracted. The mercantile interest requires that the issue be settled promptly and permanently, and upon a basis which will command the confidence of capitalists; and a new spirit of enterprise would at once be diffused throughout the trade of the country. The migration of Northern capital Southward would call for new supplies of goods, machinery and implements, which in due time would contribute largely to the national supply of products, and help forward the process of general recuperation.

3. *A Liberal Republican View.* It is easy to conceive that some northerners might favor values associated with nationalism, or that businessmen, anxious for profitable activity, would desire peace above all. But what of the idealism which had originally inspired such measures as Negro suffrage? Had that kind of impulse ceased to act upon the American mind? The following selection from *The Nation* may explain what had happened. This weekly, edited by E. L. Godkin, possessed much of the spirit motivating the "Liberal Republicans," the political idealists of the decade after Appomattox who were fighting against political corruption in the North and in behalf of white rule in the South. The excerpt indicates that events of the Reconstruction period had forced proponents of political democracy not merely to relinquish their hopes for the southern Negro but even to engage in a decisive struggle to maintain themselves among the northern whites.¹⁸ This description of conditions in South Carolina is not, of course, the whole story of Reconstruction government; there was a positive side also. But *The Nation's* editorial is important because it gives northern reformist opinion about the South.

SOCIALISM IN SOUTH CAROLINA

The cancerous disease which has struck its roots into the heart of so many of the oldest and most civilized American communities, assumes in different States different aspects. In Massachusetts—a State which has in some densely settled parts a large and ignorant working population. and, at the same time, by keeping alive the power and influence of the bar, has preserved the traditions

and usages of a period when it was governed by lawyers—the government has passed into the hands of a legal demagogue, who originally got his power by cajoling a local proletariat, and has kept it by getting control of the powerful Federal Administration, which, silently but ceaselessly working year in and year out, gradually saps the foundations of the feeble and mutable State government. In New York, a community far less homogeneous and law-abiding than Massachusetts, with a population continually changing and intent only on making money, the preliminary moves in the game were found to be easy enough by a totally different sort of leader. In New York, neither education nor a regular profession proved necessary. All that was needed was to begin with “sympathy with the masses.” After that, stealing and forging did the rest. It was Tweed’s great misfortune that he belonged to a losing party. Had he not made the mistake of allying his fortunes with the Democrats, and so losing the chance of getting permanent control of the Custom-house and Post-office, he might still be distributing coal to the poor of New York, and hold a position second not even to Mr. Thomas Murphy or Mr. Butler himself in the affections of the head of the Administration. Tweed is now in jail, while Butler is the leader of the House, but they are both products of the same general causes, with just such individual differences as we might expect from the different localities which have produced them. The same disease has been rotting away the fibre of the South Carolina government, and has produced, to feed and fatten on the corruption which engenders them, not one, but a swarm of little Tweeds and little Butlers, some black and some white. South Carolina, perhaps from her impoverished condition, has not yet reached the point at which a single demagogue or thief, armed with some Federal judge’s orders or backed by some Custom-house gang of hired voters, gets control of the local machinery and bids defiance to law and morality. “Butlerism” in South Carolina is a more complex affair.

The present condition of South Carolina can only be understood by a consideration of the character of the population and the changes which have taken place in it since the close of the war. There are now about three hundred thousand whites in the State to four hundred thousand blacks. The general effect of the Reconstruction acts may be put in a few words. They left the property of the State in the hands of the disfranchised whites, and the governing power in the hands of the negroes. From that time to this, politics in South Carolina have consisted of determined efforts on the part of a few designing men, with the aid of the negro vote, to plunder the property-holders. The first set who succeeded in

doing this were the carpet-baggers, who from 1868 to 1872 ruled the State through the negroes. Just as Tweed got the votes of the ignorant Irish in New York, or as Butler gets the votes of the “poor boys” in the shoemaking districts of Massachusetts, the carpet-baggers got the votes of the negroes. There is undoubtedly a great deal of difference among the South Carolina negroes in intelligence and morality. Among the small number of negroes in the cities who have always been free there is a good deal of industry, intelligence, and good conduct. But the average of intelligence among the rest is very low. . . . As they are ignorant, they are of course credulous. . . .

The finances of the State are involved in hopeless confusion. D. T. Corbin, United States District-Attorney, a leading Republican senator, was obliged to admit in 1872, and in a speech in favor of the re-election of General Grant, that under Governor Orr, the first reconstruction governor, the bonded debt amounted to \$5,500,000, with a floating debt of \$1,500,000 more, while at the time of his speech the State was saddled with a bonded debt of \$16,000,000 and a floating debt of two or three millions more. The money was obtained in New York by a man named Kimpton, who acted as financial agent of the State, who had been required by the Governor to give good bonds for the faithful performance of his duties, and who had accomplished this end, it was understood, by getting as sureties Henry Clews & Co. of this city. Henry Clews & Co., however, in reality only signed as witnesses to Kimpton’s signature. Kimpton managed his business so well that in 1871 the interest, commissions, and stamps paid on short loans made in New York amounted to nearly as much as the entire interest on the State debt, with a large commission account in favor of Kimpton still unsettled. There is no use, however, in going into details. It is enough that the taxable property in the State before the war was \$490,000,000, and is now assessed at \$180,000,000, while good judges are of opinion that it is not worth \$100,000,000; that the taxes levied before the war were not over \$500,000, and are now \$2,700,000, while the legislative expenses have crept up from \$40,000 a year to \$291,000, and the public printing, for a government which can neither read nor write, from \$5,000 to \$450,000; that land assessed at \$15,000 is offered in the market for \$5,000. The sum and substance of it all is confiscation. Property is no longer owned in South Carolina under the protection of the laws or Constitution; it is held until it is taken away by Beverly Nash, or Moses, or any one of the gang who govern the State by means of the votes of the colored race. Farms are sold to pay taxes; the old, rich plantations are broken up; the whites are driven out of the State or dis-

franchised, and a queer aristocracy of color is set up, with the rich Congo thief on top and the degraded Anglo-Saxon at the bottom. . . .

It is not a question any longer about the more or less good government of the State, or the rights of minorities, but whether the whites can stay in the State at all. The taxpayers have appealed to Washington for moral support, and they have been dismissed by the President with surly anger and contempt, and are now actually engaged in begging General Butler, the greatest socialistic demagogue of our day, to have a little mercy on them. It is not a mistaken instinct which leads them to him, for they know very well that the South Carolinian imitators derive their power from the steady-moving and merciless machinery which fills the custom-houses and post-offices with his tools; and it is this machinery which makes socialism in America the dangerous, deadly poison it is. Left to themselves, the whites of South Carolina would find some means to govern the State. But they are not left to themselves. They are gradually being driven out of the State, and the only question remaining to be settled is how long it will take to make the once "sovereign State" of South Carolina truly loyal, truly Republican, truly African San Domingo.

4. "*The Road to Reunion.*" The previous selections have indicated the common ground which northern and southern whites occupied. How this situation could lead to the recreation of the union is described in an editorial in *The Nation* written shortly before the last federal troops were withdrawn from the South. It is important to note what this magazine considered the indispensable condition to a successful partnership of North and South in meeting the common political and economic problems of modern times.¹⁹ These issues of contemporary American history will be treated in a second volume of Problems on the relation of government to the economy.

THE POLITICAL SOUTH HEREAFTER

The dissolution of the last sham government at the South—an event which we have a right to believe cannot now be long delayed—will place the Southern States, as regards the rest of the nation, in a position which they have not before occupied for almost a generation. Heretofore, in the discussion of nearly all national questions, the most embarrassing and vexatious element at any time to be considered, and frequently an overwhelmingly important one, was "the South." This term designated a number of contiguous States, bound together by mutual interest in the maintenance of a social system which was under-

stood to be inimical to the feelings, at least, if not to the welfare, of the inhabitants of all other States; and "the South" was always therefore, a more definite term than "the West" or "the North." Slavery dominated every other interest, and held the Southern States together in political unity. The phrase "the solid South" was a legitimate one before, during, and even after the war, and only recently has it become a political bugbear. But the threefold cord which bound the Southern States together—the defence and perpetuation of slavery, the struggle for the establishment of an independent confederacy, and the trials of reconstruction—no longer exists, and nothing has taken or can take its place. For a time, perhaps, traditions of the dead "institution," war memories, and the possession of a race of freedmen may together do something toward perpetuating a united South, but the union will surely be mostly in appearance, and any little reality which it may possess will speedily give way before opposing and stronger forces.

We believe the proposition to be almost self-evident, indeed, that hereafter there is to be no South; none, that is, in a distinctively political sense. The negro will disappear from the field of national politics. Henceforth the nation, as a nation, will have nothing more to do with him. He will undoubtedly play a part, perhaps an important one, in the development of the national civilization. The philanthropist will have still a great deal to do both with him and for him, and the sociological student will find him, curiously placed as he is in contact and competition with other races, an unfailing source of interest; but as a "ward" of the nation he can no longer be singled out for especial guardianship or peculiar treatment in preference to Irish laborers or Swedish immigrants. There is something distasteful, undeniably, in the idea of one who has played so important a part in our past political history making his final exit in the company of the Carpet-baggers; but for this unfortunate coincidence the negro is not to be blamed.

The disappearance of the factitious interest which made the South politically a unit will permit the rapid development of several natural and obvious disintegrating forces which, indeed, have been already in operation for some time, but the results of which have been obscured by the overshadowing interloper which has just been disposed of. Climate, soil, natural productions, diversity of pursuit, and varieties of race will certainly disintegrate politically the States of the South as well as the States of the North. The "sunny" South, of course, was a fiction, an agreeable convention only, for in the matter of climate the South presents variations comparable at least with any to be found in the North. St. Louis, St.

Augustine, and New Orleans, for instance, are as diverse in climate as are any three cities which might be selected in the Northern States. The pecuniary ties, moreover, which unite some Southern States to the North are already stronger than any which bind them to their former political associates. Missouri, for instance, in its commercial relations and sympathies is a Northern State, as, in a modified sense, are Maryland and Delaware; and Florida apparently is set apart already as the winter home of wealthy and invalided Northern men, whose influence upon the tone of its politics begins to be perceptible notwithstanding the hubbub of its recent performances in counting electoral votes. Again, it is evident that the cotton, rice, tobacco, and cane-producing districts of the South will attract very different classes of people, and beget very different manners and opinions from those inevitably associated with mining and manufacturing communities. Thus, South Carolina will soon differ from Missouri even more than Vermont does from Pennsylvania or Minnesota from Massachusetts. Political disintegration at the South may show itself most plainly at first in connection with the discussion of economic questions. There is to-day throughout all the Southern States, probably, a traditional inclination towards free-trade, although the leaning is not a very decided one, and the change from this to an opposing attitude is a process which may be witnessed soon in several of them. Is it not possible, at least, that the cotton and rice States may increase their present leaning towards free-trade, while Louisiana, Virginia, and Kentucky demand protection against Cuban sugar and tobacco? Or, on the other hand, may not South Carolina yearn for Government aid in the establishment of manufactories, and New Orleans sigh for free-trade in Mississippi products? Will the present great poverty of the Southern States, again, incline them to give ear to the jingle of "silver" theories, and make "greenback" delusions easy of belief, or will the memory of their own once plentiful "scrip" be a sufficient protection against indulgence in financial heresies? And will the South look with longing eyes upon visions of canals and railroads until it heedlessly begins the cry for internal improvements at Government expense, or will it be warned by the ghosts of *Crédit Mobilier* and Northern Pacific? It is evident, we believe, without lengthening the list of these enumerations or suggestions, that the Southern States may soon be as divided upon the subjects of tariff, currency, *laissez-faire* or paternity in government, etc., as we have been and still are at the North, and if New Hampshire and North Carolina should happen to join hands in defence of some political theory in opposition (say) to Louisiana and New York, "the South" would

soon become as vague an expression, from a political point of view, as "the West" is now.

The future of the freedman will be bound up undoubtedly with that of the white man, and does not now require separate consideration. Great numbers of negroes will certainly remain upon the cotton-fields, rice-swamps, and cane and tobacco plantations, and, being employed as field-hands, their political opinions for a long time to come will inevitably reflect those of their employers. Others will learn to work in factories or become mechanics and small farmers, and, generally, all over the South for a long time, negroes will fill the places now filled at the North by Irish, German, and Chinese laborers. The political influence of the freedman, considered as distinct from that of the white man, will be almost imperceptible. His ultimate influence upon our civilization, as determined by the relative fecundity of the two races, and their action and reaction upon one another as the negro becomes better educated and more independent, is a subject which can be discussed more profitably a generation hence.

Generally speaking, while the political breaking up of the South will do away with a powerful barrier to national advancement, and will bring each State into closer sympathy with the national Government, nevertheless we hardly expect to receive any immediate and valuable aid from the South toward the solution of our present executive, judicial, and legislative problems. In this, however, we may happily be mistaken. It is true that the South has long been more "provincial" than the North, that it is far from possessing similar educational advantages, that it is now almost barren of literary productions or literary and scientific men, and that these facts would seem to indicate a natural soil for the germination and growth of all kinds of crude and coarse theories of society and government; but, on the other hand, it is not easy to imagine the South developing theories more crude than some now cherished in Indiana and Pennsylvania, and which find shelter even in New York and Massachusetts. We are inclined to believe, also, that the average man of the South is a more pliant and enthusiastic follower of his chosen leader than the average man of the North, and the Gordons, Hills, Lamars, and Hamptons may be depended upon to exert a widespread and, in the main, healthful influence. . . . But the important point to be remembered here is the fact that *all* political contributions of the South, of whatever character, will hereafter go towards the upbuilding of a national as distinguished from a "sectional" unity. For the first time in our history we are entitled to assert that there is no danger of national dissolution. Heretofore our chief attention has been

given to the saving of national life, and only incidentally have we been able to consider its character or to decide upon the best methods of perfecting it. We can now devote ourselves to

legitimate politics—that is, to studies of governmental science—with a fair prospect of being able to throw some light upon many of the unsolved problems of modern life.

NOTES

NOTES TO PROBLEM I

- ¹ Hans Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism* (1944), pp. 3-18. Reprinted by permission of the author.
- ² Hezekiah Niles, *Principles and Acts of the Revolution in America* (1876), p. 203.
- ³ *Ibid.*, p. 170.
- ⁴ Worthington C. Ford, ed., *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789* (1904-1937), I, 65-69.
- ⁵ Text of "Association," *ibid.*, I, 75-77.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, II, 142-55.
- ⁷ Moncure D. Conway, ed., *The Writings of Thomas Paine* (1894), I, 84-87. Reprinted by permission of G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- ⁸ Niles, *Principles and Acts of the Revolution*, p. 132.
- ⁹ Ford, ed., *Journals of the Continental Congress*, V, 510-15.
- ¹⁰ *Public Records of the State of Connecticut*, I (1894), 3.
- ¹¹ Charles C. Tansill, ed., *Documents Illustrative of the Formation of the Union of the American States* (1927), p. 239.
- ¹² Claude H. Van Tyne, *The American Revolution* (1905), p. 182.
- ¹³ John R. Williams, ed., *Philip Vickers Fithian, Journal and Letters* (1900), I, 284-97. Reprinted by permission of the Librarian, Princeton University.
- ¹⁴ "Journal of Josiah Quincy, Junior," *Massachusetts Historical Society, Proceedings*, XLIX (1916), 454-57. Reprinted by permission of the Massachusetts Historical Society.
- ¹⁵ Edmund C. Burnett, ed., *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress* (1921-1936), I, 517-18.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 420-21.
- ¹⁷ Charles Francis Adams, ed., *The Works of John Adams* (1850-1856), II, 398-400.
- ¹⁸ John C. Fitzpatrick, ed., *The Writings of George Washington* (1931-1940), V, 361-62.
- ¹⁹ Josiah Tucker, *Cui Bono?* (1781), pp. 117-19.
- ²⁰ *The Poetical Works of John Trumbull*, LL. D. (1820), II, 158-59.
- ²¹ First published in 1793 in Elihu Hubbard Smith, ed., *American Poems, Selected and Original*, pp. 62-63.
- ²² Noah Webster, *Dissertations on the English Language* (1789), pp. 18-23, 397, 406.
- ²³ From the third letter of *Letters from An American Farmer* (1782), Everyman's Library, ed., pp. 41-44.
- ²⁴ David Ramsay, *History of the American Revolution* (1811), Appendix IV.
- ²⁵ Fitzpatrick, ed., *Writings of Washington*, XXXV, 218-23.
- ²⁶ Burnett, ed., *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress*, I, 35.
- ²⁷ Peter Force, ed., *American Archives* (1837-1853), 4th series, III, 1351-52.
- ²⁸ From *James Madison, the Virginia Revolutionist*, p. 456, by Irving Brant, Copyright 1941. Used by special permission of the Publishers, The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

²⁹ Burnett, ed., *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress*, III, 50.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, IV, 11.

³¹ Louise Rau, ed., "Sergeant John Smith's Diary of 1776," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XX (1933-1934), 269-70. Reprinted by permission of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association.

³² *Diary of Frederick Mackenzie* (1930), I, 61-62. Reprinted by permission of the Harvard University Press; *Revolutionary Services and Civil Life of General William Hull, Prepared from His Manuscripts by his Daughter, Mrs. Maria Campbell* (1848), pp. 37-38.

NOTES TO PROBLEM II

- ¹ John C. Fitzpatrick, ed., *The Writings of George Washington* (1931-1940), XVIII, 453.
- ² Charles C. Tansill, ed., *Documents Illustrative of the Formation of the Union of the American States* (1927), p. 239.
- ³ H. R. McIlwaine, ed., *Official Letters of the Governors of the State of Virginia*, Vol. I, "The Letters of Patrick Henry" (1926), 227-29.
- ⁴ Francis Newton Thorpe, ed., *The Federal and State Constitutions* (1909), VI, 3248-57.
- ⁵ Edmund C. Burnett, ed., *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress* (1921-1936), II, 275-77.
- ⁶ Letter of July 28, in *ibid.*, II, 28, 32.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 345-46.
- ⁸ Worthington C. Ford, ed., *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789* (1904-1937), IX, 932-34.
- ⁹ *The American Museum*, I (1787), 6-7.
- ¹⁰ John Jay, "Address to the People of New York," in Paul Leicester Ford, ed., *Pamphlets on the Constitution of the United States* (1888), pp. 72-74.
- ¹¹ Edmund Randolph, "Letter on the Federal Constitution," Oct. 16, 1787, in *ibid.*, pp. 264-65; *Connecticut Courant*, Nov. 12, 1787.
- ¹² *The Federalist*, No. 15.
- ¹³ Tansill, ed., *Documents Illustrative of the Formation of the Union*, pp. 116-19.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 204-07.
- ¹⁵ The debates, transcribed partly in the first person, partly in the third, are from Madison's notes, in *ibid.*, pp. 249, 181-82, 183-84, 301, 251-52.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 297, 304, 329, 323.
- ¹⁷ *The American Museum*, I (1787), 494-95.
- ¹⁸ Henry Cabot Lodge, ed., *The Works of Alexander Hamilton* (1903), I, 420-22. Reprinted by permission of G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- ¹⁹ Samuel Bannister Harding, *The Contest over the Ratification of the Federal Constitution in . . . Massachusetts* (1896), pp. 122-24. Reprinted by permission of the Harvard University Press.
- ²⁰ Paul Leicester Ford, ed., *Essays on the Constitution of the United States* (1892), pp. 139-41.
- ²¹ Ford, ed., *Pamphlets on the Constitution of the United States* (1888), pp. 243-44.
- ²² *Ibid.*, pp. 283-84, 319-21.
- ²³ *Documentary History of the Constitution of the United States of America* (G. P. O., 1905), IV, 441.

²⁴ *The Federalist*, No. 39.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, No. 10.

NOTES TO PROBLEM III

¹ Henry Adams, *History of the United States during the Administrations of Jefferson and Madison* (1889-1891), pp. 5-8.

² Edward Gibbon Wakefield, *England and America* (1834), pp. 198-200.

³ *Compendium of the Seventh Census*, p. 61.

⁴ Frances Wright D'Arusmont, *Views of Society and Manners in America* (1821), pp. 385-96.

⁵ Guy S. Callender, *Selections from the Economic History of the United States, 1765-1860* (1909), pp. 272-74. Reprinted by permission of Ginn and Company.

⁶ Richard K. Crallé, ed., *Works of John C. Calhoun* (1851-1867), II, 188-92.

⁷ James D. Richardson, ed., *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897* (1900), I, 322.

⁸ *Cohens v. Virginia* (1821), 6 Wheaton 264.

⁹ Richardson, ed., *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, II, 218.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, II, 311-16.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, II, 590-91.

¹² Speech of Commodore Robert F. Stockton, Dec. 30, 1847, in *Niles' National Register*, Jan. 22, 1848.

¹³ Frederick Jackson Turner, *Sections in American History* (1932), pp. 26-51. Reprinted by permission of Henry Holt and Company.

¹⁴ From Madison's notes in Charles C. Tansill, ed., *Documents Illustrative of the Formation of the Union of the United States* (1927), pp. 310-11.

¹⁵ Jonathan Elliot, ed., *Debates in the Several State Conventions on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution* (1836), III, 311-12, 576.

¹⁶ Paul Leicester Ford, ed., *Writings of Jefferson* (1892-1899), I, 192.

¹⁷ *Annals of Congress*, 2 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 400.

¹⁸ E. S. Brown, ed., *The Missouri Compromises . . . from the Letters of William Plumer* (1926), pp. 11-12, 41. Reprinted by permission of the Missouri Historical Society.

¹⁹ Harriet Martineau, *Society in America* (1837), I, 135-38.

²⁰ *Congressional Globe*, 28 Cong., 2 Sess., Appendix, pp. 313-14.

NOTES TO PROBLEM IV

¹ Compiled by the editors from U. S. Weather Bureau, Bulletin W., *Summaries of Climatology Data by Sections* (1912).

² Ulrich B. Phillips, *Life and Labor in the Old South* (1929), pp. 3-6. Reprinted by permission of Little, Brown & Company.

³ Reprinted from *Human Geography of the South*, pp. 351-53, 366-77, by Rupert B. Vance, by permission of The University of North Carolina Press. Copyright, 1932, by The University of North Carolina Press.

⁴ *Compendium of the U. S. Census for 1850*, p. 40.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 338-93.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 125.

⁷ Thomas P. Kettell, *Southern Wealth and Northern Profits* (1860), p. 145.

⁸ Sarah A. Emery, *Reminiscences of a Nonagenarian* (1879), pp. 27-29.

⁹ Samuel G. Goodrich, *Recollections of a Lifetime* (1856), I, 59-61, 77-81, 83-85.

¹⁰ Harriet Martineau, *Society in America* (1837), II, 242-50.

¹¹ Reprinted by permission of the publishers, The Arthur H. Clark Company, from *Documentary History of American Industrial Society* (1909-1911), edited by J. R. Commons and others, VII, 132-35.

¹² *Preliminary Report on the Eighth Census, 1860* (1862), pp. 59, 61, 65-66.

¹³ Anthony Trollope, *North America* (1862), pp. 182-206.

¹⁴ The text of these selections and the sequence of their arrangement are taken from Ina Faye Woestemeyer and J. Montgomery Gambrill, *The Westward Movement* (1939), pp. 55-69, with permission of Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.; Henry B. Fearon, *Sketches of America* (1818), pp. 221-23; Timothy Flint, *Recollections of the Last Ten Years* (1826), pp. 175-77; Harriet Martineau, *Society in America*, I, 162-63; St. John de Crèvecoeur, *Sketches of Eighteenth Century America* (1925), edited by Henri L. Bourdin, Ralph H. Gabriel and Stanley T. Williams (Reprinted by permission of the Yale University Press), pp. 62-78.

¹⁵ Thomas Cooper, *Some Information Respecting America* (1794), pp. 116-18.

¹⁶ Baynard Rush Hall, *The New Purchase* (1852, reprint edited by J. A. Woodburn, 1916), pp. 214-17. Reprinted by permission of the Princeton University Press.

¹⁷ S. R. Brown, *Western Gazetteer or Emigrant's Directory* (1817), pp. 91-94.

NOTES TO PROBLEM V

¹ A. De Puy Van Buren, *Jottings of a Year's Sojourn in the South* (1859), *passim*.

² Timothy Flint, *Recollections of the Last Ten Years* (1826), pp. 335-37.

³ Thomas E. Watson, *Bethany* (1904), selections from Chapter I. Reprinted by permission of Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.

⁴ Mark Twain, *Huckleberry Finn*, Chapter 32.

⁵ Timothy Dwight, *Travels in New-England and New-York* (1821), II, 458-62.

⁶ David Crockett, *An Account of Col. Crockett's Tour to the North and Down East* (1835), p. 67.

⁷ *De Bow's Review*, XXVIII (January 1860), 9-14.

⁸ Richard Hildreth, *Despotism in America, etc.* (1840), pp. 142-55.

⁹ Charles A. and Mary R. Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization* (1934), I, 678-81. Copyright 1927, 1930, and 1933 by The Macmillan Company and used with their permission.

¹⁰ Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *The Age of Jackson* (1945), pp. 77-79. Reprinted by permission of Little, Brown & Company.

¹¹ Homer C. Hockett, *Western Influences on Political Parties to 1826* (1916), pp. 91-126. Reprinted by permission of the author.

¹² Alexander Mackay, *The Western World, or Travels in the United States in 1846-47* (1849), pp. 44-51.

¹³ Raynor G. Wellington, *The Political and Sec-*

tional Influence of the Public Lands, 1828-1842 (1914), pp. 5-10, 18, 23-24, 114-16. Reprinted by permission of the author.

¹⁴ Charles O. Paullin, *Atlas of the Historical Geography of the United States* (1932), p. 111. The selections from the Paullin *Atlas* in this Problem are reprinted by permission of the Carnegie Institution of Washington.

¹⁵ *Journal of the House of Representatives*, 22 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 1074.

¹⁶ Paullin, *Atlas of the Historical Geography of the United States*, pp. 110-11.

¹⁷ *House Journal*, 21 Cong., 1 Sess., pp. 181-82; Paullin, *Atlas*, p. 113.

NOTES TO PROBLEM VI

The quotation on the title page is reprinted by permission of G. P. Putnam's Sons.

¹ Frances Anne Kemble, *A Journal of a Residence on a Georgian Plantation* (1863), pp. 30-31, 42-43, 54, 59-61, 200.

² Susan Dabney Smedes, *Memorials of a Southern Planter* (1887), pp. 47-48, 68-70, 71-72, 73-74.

³ This selection and the following one are reprinted by permission of the publishers, The Arthur H. Clark Company, from: Phillips (Ulrich B.) *Plantation and Frontier Documents*, I, 112-14, in John R. Commons and others, eds., *A Documentary History of American Industrial Society* (1909-1911).

⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 126.

⁵ B. A. Botkin, *Lay My Burden Down*, p. 75. This selection and the three following are reprinted by permission of The University of Chicago Press.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 109.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 89-91.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 123-29.

⁹ Frederick Law Olmsted, *Journey in the Seaboard Slave States* (1856), pp. 32-40, quoting *Chambers' Monthly Magazine*.

¹⁰ Lewis C. Gray, "Economic Efficiency and Competitive Advantages of Slavery under the Plantation System," *Agricultural History*, IV (1930), 33-34, 35-36, 38, 40-41. Reprinted by permission of the Agricultural History Society.

¹¹ Ulrich B. Phillips, *Life and Labor in the Old South* (1929), pp. 170-72. Reprinted by permission of Little, Brown & Company.

¹² Reprinted from *Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South*, pp. 201-4, by William S. Jenkins by permission of The University of North Carolina Press. Copyright, 1935, by The University of North Carolina Press.

¹³ James Henry Hammond, *Two Letters on Slavery in the United States, Addressed to Thomas Clarkson, Esq.* (1845), pp. 33-34.

¹⁴ Richard K. Crallé, ed., *Works of John C. Calhoun* (1851-1867), II, 631-32.

¹⁵ Michael W. Cluskey, ed., *Speeches . . . of . . . Albert G. Brown* (1859), pp. 484-85.

¹⁶ Dwight L. Dumond, *Anti-Slavery Origins of the Civil War in the United States* (1939), pp. 41-43. Reprinted by permission of The University of Michigan Press.

¹⁷ Avery O. Craven, *The Coming of the Civil War*

(1942), pp. 75-77, 82. Reprinted by permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

¹⁸ George Fort Milton, *The Eve of Conflict: Stephen A. Douglas and the Needless War* (1934), pp. 161-64. Reprinted by permission of the author.

NOTES TO PROBLEM VII

¹ Alice Felt Tyler, *Freedom's Ferment* (1944).

² Herbert W. Schneider, "Religious Revivals," *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* (1934), XIII, 363-65. Copyright 1934 by The Macmillan Company and used with their permission.

³ *Autobiography, Correspondence, etc. of Lyman Beecher*, II (1864), 89-90.

⁴ *Memoirs of Rev. Charles G. Finney* (1876), pp. 185-88.

⁵ Gilbert H. Barnes, *The Anti-Slavery Impulse, 1830-1844* (1933), pp. 10-11. Reprinted by permission of the American Historical Association.

⁶ *The Works of William E. Channing* (1841), III, 196-97; I, Introductory Remarks, xvi, xix, xxi.

⁷ Ralph Waldo Emerson, "New England Reformers," *Essays: Second Series* (1844), pp. 275-78.

⁸ *The Abolitionist*, I, No. XII, December 1833.

⁹ *Address of the Managers of the American Colonization Society to the People of the United States* (1832), pp. 3-8.

¹⁰ Dwight L. Dumond, ed., *Letters of James Gillespie Birney, 1831-1857* (1938) [hereafter referred to as *Birney Letters*], II, 1175; I, 439-40, 179-80, 113. The selections from the *Birney Letters* in this Problem are reprinted by permission of the American Historical Association.

¹¹ Gilbert H. Barnes and Dwight L. Dumond, eds., *Letters of Theodore Dwight Weld, Angelina Grimké Weld and Sarah Grimké, 1822-1844* (1934) [hereafter referred to as *Weld-Grimké Letters*], I, 146, 244; II, 911-12, 923. The selections from the *Weld-Grimké Letters* in this Problem are reprinted by permission of the American Historical Association.

¹² *Weld-Grimké Letters*, I, 134-35, 273, 423-24; *Birney Letters*, I, 270, 269, 243.

¹³ Theodore Dwight Weld, *American Slavery As It Is: Testimony of a Thousand Witnesses*, Table of Contents.

¹⁴ Harriet Beecher Stowe, *Uncle Tom's Cabin, or Life Among the Lowly* (1852), II, 154, 155-56, 163-67.

¹⁵ *Weld-Grimké Letters*, I, 171, 173.

¹⁶ *Birney Letters*, I, 250.

¹⁷ Edward Beecher, *Narrative of Riots at Alton* (1838), pp. 103-7.

¹⁸ *Birney Letters*, I, 183-84, 223-24; *Weld-Grimké Letters*, I, 318-19, 485-86.

¹⁹ *Appendix to the Congressional Globe*, 31 Cong., 1 Sess., XXII, Pt. 1, 275.

²⁰ Dwight L. Dumond, *Anti-Slavery Origins of the Civil War in the United States* (1939), pp. 103-4, reprinted by permission of The University of Michigan Press; James G. Randall, *The Civil War and Reconstruction* (1937), pp. 146-47, reprinted by permission of James G. Randall, and D. C. Heath and Company; Charles A. and Mary R. Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization* (1934), I, 699-701, copyright 1927, 1930, and 1933 by The Macmillan Company and used with their permission.

NOTES TO PROBLEM VIII

¹ Richard K. Crallé, ed., *Works of John C. Calhoun* (1851-1867), IV, 382-84, 542-51, 556-58.

² H. M. Flint, *Life of Stephen A. Douglas* (1860), Appendix, pp. 4-6.

³ *Works of Daniel Webster* (1851), V, 350-53.

⁴ George E. Baker, ed., *Works of William H. Seward* (1853), I, 62-80.

⁵ *Supplements to the Revised Statutes: General Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Passed Subsequently to the Revised Statutes* (1854), I, 261.

⁶ *U. S. Statutes at Large*, IX, 462-64.

⁷ *Ableman v. Booth* (1859), 21 Howard 513-15.

⁸ Charles E. Stevens, *Anthony Burns, A History* (1856), pp. 15-19, 31-32, 33, 41-44, 143, 145-47, 147-50.

⁹ *U. S. Statutes at Large*, X, 277, 282-83.

¹⁰ *Scott v. Sandford* (1857), 19 Howard 432, 449-52.

¹¹ Edwin Earle Sparks, ed., *The Lincoln-Douglas Debates of 1858* (1908), pp. 453-55, 426-27, 494-96. Reprinted by permission of the Illinois State Historical Library.

¹² From *Abraham Lincoln: His Speeches and Writings*, Roy P. Basler, ed., 1946, pp. 301-8, published and copyrighted by The World Publishing Company, Cleveland, Ohio. For generous permission to use this edition—the most accurate text of Lincoln's writings—both in the present selection and in many others cited below, we are indebted to the World Publishing Company.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 333-34, 567-68, 580-81.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 291-92, 402-04; Sparks, ed., *Lincoln-Douglas Debates*, pp. 267-68, 303, reprinted by permission of the Illinois State Historical Library.

¹⁵ Arthur C. Cole, "Lincoln's Election an Immediate Menace to Slavery in the States?", *American Historical Review*, XXXVI (1931), 740-42, 753-55; J. G. de R. Hamilton, *ibid.*, XXXVII (1932), 703-5. Reprinted by permission of the American Historical Association.

¹⁶ Reprinted by permission of Dodd, Mead & Company, Inc. From *Lincoln the President*, pp. 237-41, by James G. Randall. Copyright, 1945, by Dodd, Mead & Company, Inc.

NOTES TO PROBLEM IX

¹ *Letters and Other Writings of James Madison* (1865), IV, 61-62.

² Proclamation, Dec. 10, 1832, in James D. Richardson, *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897* (1900), II, 650.

³ Joseph Story, *Commentaries on the Constitution* (1891), I, 149-52.

⁴ Alexander H. Stephens, *A Constitutional View of the Late War Between the States* (1868-1870), II, 21-24.

⁵ Roy P. Basler, ed., *Abraham Lincoln: His Speeches and Writings* (1946), pp. 603-4.

⁶ Stephen Leacock, *Elements of Political Science* (1906), pp. 22-51. Reprinted by permission of Houghton Mifflin Company.

⁷ George E. Baker, ed., *Works of William H. Seward* (1853-1861), I, 89-91; IV, 640-41.

⁸ Howard C. Perkins, ed., *Northern Editorials on Secession* (1942), II, 932-34. The two selections from *Northern Editorials* in this Problem are reprinted by permission of the American Historical Association.

⁹ Jonathan Elliot, ed., *Debates in the Several State Conventions on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution* (1836), IV, 540-44.

¹⁰ Jefferson Davis, *Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government* (1881), I, 157-58.

¹¹ *Writings and Speeches of Daniel Webster* (1903), VI, 14, 54-55, 195-96, 200-1, 208-10; XIII, 438-39. Reprinted by permission of Little, Brown & Company.

¹² Basler, ed., *Lincoln, Speeches and Writings*, pp. 582-83, 586-87.

¹³ Raymond G. Gettell, *History of American Political Thought* (1928), p. 295.

¹⁴ Charles C. Tansill, ed., *Documents Illustrative of the Formation of the Union of the American States* (1927), pp. 434, 439, 371, 482, 647, 648, 651, 702.

¹⁵ Story, *Commentaries*, I, 352.

¹⁶ Stephens, *Constitutional View of the War Between the States*, I, 137-42.

¹⁷ Albert T. Bledsoe, *Is Davis a Traitor?* (1866), pp. 59-70.

¹⁸ Perkins, ed., *Northern Editorials*, I, 163-64.

¹⁹ *De Bow's Review*, X, 106-8.

NOTES TO PROBLEM X

The quotation on the title page is taken from Ulrich B. Phillips, *The Course of the South to Secession*, pp. 136-37. Reprinted by permission of the American Historical Association.

¹ In Roy P. Basler, ed., *Abraham Lincoln: His Speeches and Writings* (1946), pp. 582-88.

² John G. Nicolay and John Hay, *Abraham Lincoln, A History* (1886), III, 333, footnote.

³ John G. Nicolay and John Hay, eds., *Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln* (1905), VI, 224.

⁴ Dwight L. Dumond, ed., *Southern Editorials on Secession* (1931), pp. 475-76. This editorial and that cited in the following selection are reprinted by permission of the American Historical Association.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 476-79.

⁶ Howard C. Perkins, ed., *Northern Editorials on Secession* (1942), 645-47. Reprinted by permission of the American Historical Association.

⁷ David M. Potter, *Lincoln and His Party in the Secession Crisis* (1942), pp. 330-31. This selection and others cited from the same work in this Problem, are reprinted by permission of the Yale University Press.

⁸ Basler, ed., *Lincoln, Speeches and Writings*, pp. 594-97.

⁹ Mrs. Chapman Coleman, *Life of John J. Crittenden* (1871), II, 337-38.

¹⁰ Reprinted by permission of Dodd, Mead & Company, Inc. from *Lincoln and the Civil War*, p. 30, by Tyler Dennett. Copyright, 1939, by Dodd, Mead & Company, Inc.

¹¹ John T. Morse, ed., *The Diary of Gideon Welles* (1911), I, 9, 13. Reprinted by permission of Houghton Mifflin Company.

¹² Potter, *Lincoln and His Party in the Secession Crisis*, pp. 341-42.

¹³ Memorandum of General Scott in *The War of the Rebellion, A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies* (1880-1901), Series I, Vol. I, 200-1.

- ¹⁴ Samuel W. Crawford, *The Genesis of the Civil War, The Story of Sumter* (1887), p. 365.
- ¹⁵ *Official Records, Armies*, Series I, Vol. I, 226.
- ¹⁶ Nicolay and Hay, *Abraham Lincoln, A History*, III, 393-94.
- ¹⁷ *Official Records, Armies*, Series I, Vol. I, 360.
- ¹⁸ *Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies* (1896), Series I, Vol. IV, 109.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 110.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, 232.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, 235.
- ²² *Ibid.*, 247-50.
- ²³ Nicolay and Hay, eds., *Complete Works of Lincoln*, VI, 239-40. For proof of the separate sending of the two copies of this letter see, *Official Records, Armies*, Ser. I, Vol. I, 252, 294.
- ²⁴ Nicolay and Hay, eds., *Complete Works of Lincoln*, IV, 241.
- ²⁵ *Official Records, Armies*, Ser. I, Vol. I, 251.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, 13.
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*, 13-14.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, 14.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*
- ³¹ Henry G. Connor, *John Archibald Campbell* (1920), pp. 123-29.
- ³² *Journal of Southern History*, III (1937), 259-88 *passim*. Reprinted by permission of *The Journal of Southern History*.
- ³³ Potter, *Lincoln and His Party in the Secession Crisis*, pp. 373-74.

NOTES TO PROBLEM XI

- ¹ Roy P. Basler, ed., *Abraham Lincoln: His Speeches and Writings* (1946), pp. 391-93, 792-93.
- ² Howard C. Perkins, ed., *Northern Editorials on Secession* (1942), II, 822-24. The selections from *Northern Editorials* in this Problem are reprinted by permission of the American Historical Association.
- ³ Henry Wilson, *History of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America* (1872-1877), I, 1-2; III, 725-26.
- ⁴ E. A. Pollard, *The Lost Cause Regained* (1868), pp. 13-14.
- ⁵ Alexander H. Stephens, *A Constitutional View of the Late War Between the States* (1868-1870), I, 536-39.
- ⁶ Dwight L. Dumond, ed., *Southern Editorials on Secession* (1931), pp. 388-89. The two selections from *Southern Editorials* in this Problem are reprinted by permission of the American Historical Association.
- ⁷ Perkins, ed., *Northern Editorials*, II, 830.
- ⁸ Dumond, ed., *Southern Editorials*, pp. 511-12.
- ⁹ *Journal of the House of Representatives*, 37 Cong., 1 Sess., pp. 123-25.
- ¹⁰ Basler, ed., *Lincoln, Speeches and Writings*, p. 652.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 734.
- ¹² From *Lincoln*, p. 442, by Nathaniel Wright Stephenson, copyright 1924. Used by special permission of the Publishers, The Bobbs-Merrill Company.
- ¹³ A. M. Simons, *Class Struggles in America* (1903), pp. 62-67. Reprinted by permission of Charles H. Kerr & Company.
- ¹⁴ Charles A. and Mary R. Beard, *The Rise of*

American Civilization (1927), II, 3-7, 36-38, 39-41, 105-6. Copyright 1927, 1930, and 1933 by The Macmillan Company and used with their permission.

¹⁵ Perkins, ed., *Northern Editorials*, I, 531-33.

¹⁶ Edward Channing, *A History of the United States* (1925), VI, 3-4, copyright 1925 by The Macmillan Company and used with their permission. From *Epic of America*, pp. 250-55, by James Truslow Adams. Copyright 1931, 1933 by James Truslow Adams. Reprinted by permission of Little, Brown & Company and the Atlantic Monthly Press.

¹⁷ James G. Randall, "The Civil War Restudied," in *Journal of Southern History*, VI (1940), 441-49. Reprinted by permission of *The Journal of Southern History*.

¹⁸ George E. Baker, ed., *Works of William H. Seward* (1861), IV, 289-302.

¹⁹ Avery O. Craven, *The Repressible Conflict* (1939), pp. 63-96. Reprinted by permission of the Louisiana State University Press.

²⁰ Charles Francis Adams, *Studies, Military and Diplomatic* (1911), pp. 204-9. Copyright 1911 by The Macmillan Company and used with their permission.

²¹ Gerald W. Johnson, *The Secession of the Southern States* (1933), pp. 13, 48-54, 117-18. Reprinted by permission of G. P. Putnam's Sons.

²² James Russell Lowell, *Collected Works* (1890), VI, 211-14.

NOTES TO PROBLEM XII

¹ *Congressional Globe*, 39 Cong., 1 Sess., Pt. 1, pp. 675, 680, 683, 686, 687.

² 39 Cong. 1 Sess., *Senate Executive Document No. 2*, p. 43.

³ *Congressional Globe*, 39 Cong. 2 Sess., Pt. 1, p. 252.

⁴ This excerpt from Governor Humphreys speech is given in A. H. Stone, "Legal Status of Freedmen," *Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society*, IV (1901), 162. Reprinted by permission of the Department of Archives and History, State of Mississippi.

⁵ Edward McPherson, *The Political History of the United States of America during the Period of Reconstruction* (1880), pp. 52-55.

⁶ Howard K. Beale, *The Critical Year* (1930), pp. 177-78, reprinted by permission of Harcourt, Brace and Company; George Fort Milton, *The Age of Hate* (1930), p. 220, reprinted by permission of Coward-McCann, Inc.

⁷ Claude G. Bowers, *The Tragic Era* (1929).

⁸ *Life and Times of Frederick Douglass*, Written by Himself (1881), pp. 385, 384.

⁹ *Congressional Globe*, 40 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 205; from *The Life of Thaddeus Stevens*, p. 527, by James Albert Woodburn, copyright 1913, 1941, and used by special permission of the Publishers, The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

¹⁰ W. E. B. DuBois, *Black Reconstruction* (1935), pp. 165-66. Reprinted by permission of Harcourt, Brace and Company.

¹¹ Henry T. Thompson, *Ousting the Carpetbagger from South Carolina* (1926), pp. 13-14. Reprinted by permission of Mrs. C. B. Gopen, Mrs. Henry Malone, and Mrs. William C. Stewart.

¹² Reprinted by permission of Dodd, Mead & Company, Inc. From *Lincoln, the Liberal Statesman*

p. 85, by James G. Randall. Copyright, 1947, by Dodd, Mead & Company, Inc.

¹³ J. R. Ficklen, *History of Reconstruction in Louisiana* in Johns Hopkins University, *Studies in Historical and Political Science*, XXVIII (1910), 98-99. Reprinted by permission of The Johns Hopkins Press.

¹⁴ Roy P. Basler, ed., *Abraham Lincoln: His Speeches and Writings* (1946), pp. 796-801.

¹⁵ John A. Andrew, *Valedictory Address to the Two*

Branches of the Legislature of Massachusetts (1866), pp. 11, 12, 14, 15-16, 18, 38.

¹⁶ E. P. Oberholtzer, *Jay Cooke, Financier of the Civil War* (1907), II, 28-29. Reprinted by permission of the Macrae Smith Company.

¹⁷ *The Commercial and Financial Chronicle* (1867), pp. 231-32.

¹⁸ *The Nation*, XVIII (Apr. 16, 1874), 247-48.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, XXIV (Apr. 5, 1877), 202-3.